A

GENERAL

VINDICATION

OF

THE REMARKS ON THE CHARGE

OF THE

BISHOP OF DURHAM.

CONTAINING

A REPLY

TO A LETTER FROM A CLERGYMAN OF THE DIOCESE OF DURHAM, (SECOND ED.)

A REPLY

TO THE

OBSERVATIONS OF THE REV. THOS LE MESURIER,
Rector of Newnton Longville.

A REPLY

TO THE STRICTURES OF THE REV. G. S. FABER,
Vicar of Stockton upon Tees.

AND SOME

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE MORE FASHIONABLE METHODS OF INTERPRETING THE APOCALYPSE.

Let not those (who charge the Papists to be Idolaters) lead the People by the Nose to believe they can prove their Supposition when they cannot. *Thorndike, Just Weights*, p. 11.

NEWCASTLE:

PRINTED BY S. HODGSON:—SOLD BY BELL, QUAYSIDE, NEWCASTLE,—KEATING, LONDON,—TODD, YORK,—SHARROCK, PRESTON,—AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1808

VINDICATION, &c.

THERE are ſcarcely any ſubjects of literary inveſtigation, which at certain periods take a ſtronger hold of the mind, or more readily awaken the paſſions, than thoſe which are connected with religious controverſy. The Remarks, which a catholic writer lately ventured to offer on the biſhop of Durham's charge (a charge containing, in the opinion of the moſt unprejudiced judges, a cruel and unprovoked attack on the opinions of catholics), appear to have alarmed and irritated the zeal of ſeveral among the watchmen of the holy city. I ſay of ſeveral, becauſe I know that many members of that reſpectable body, the eſtabliſhed clergy, have condemned the acrimony of the biſhop's pamphlet, and have lamented that it was ever made the ſubject of public diſcuſſion. Scarcely, however, had two months elapſed from the firſt publication of the Remarks, before two reverend apologiſts had emptied the vials of their vengeance on the head of the writer. Their characters and pretenſions ſeem to be of very different orders. The firſt that appeared in the field was a gentleman of Rabbinical deſcent, by name Elijah Index, whom gaiety inſtead of learning furniſhed with arms, and zeal inſtead of prudence urged to the conteſt. But his campaign was ſpeedily terminated. Elijah, after a ſhort ſtruggle,

found his own *naïveté* and *ridicule* so successfully retorted on himself, that he had the good sense to seek a timely and precipitate retreat. At his departure, a clergyman of the diocese of Durham volunteered as his substitute, but wisely refused to wear his uniform. Instead of *naïveté* and *ridicule*, he seized the rusty weapons of antiquated controvertists, and endeavoured to overpower his adversary with scraps and extracts from their writings. His name, indeed, he has judged it prudent to conceal: yet to aid the conjectures of his readers, he has kindly condescended to favour them with his portrait. "I am," he says, "of a heavy disposi-"tion, clumsy and aukward, and a dull matter-of-"fact enquirer." (*a*) His claim to these admirable qualifications it would ill become me to dispute. Indeed, his work appears to depose in his favour; and I have traced, with considerable satisfaction, the features of the parent in those of his offspring. One expression only I beg leave to improve, by adding, that if he be a matter-of-fact enquirer, he has seldom the good fortune to be a matter-of-fact discoverer.

The matter of fact, to which the clergyman had devoted his attention, was not a subject of very difficult investigation. It required no extraordinary diligence of research, no peculiar powers of discrimination. It was merely to decide, which of the two, the bishop of Durham, or the author of the Remarks, had delineated with greater accuracy the doctrines of the catholic church. That their delineations are contradictory, is evident; and the consequence must be, that one of them has knowingly or ignorantly incurred the guilt of misrepresenta-

(*a*) Clergyman's Letter, p. 8.

tion. The charges which the biſhop has ſo pointedly preferred, the remarker has as emphatically denied: the odious doctrines which the firſt has with ſo much liberality beſtowed, the other has with equal pertinacity refuſed. Now the preſumption is, as far as I may be allowed to judge, in favour of the remarker. It is not natural to ſuppoſe, that a catholic clergyman, who has ſtudied in a catholic univerſity, and has been in the habit of teaching the catholic doctrine, can be ignorant of his own creed. But it is poſſible that his right reverend opponent may have applied with greater application to the ſtudy of the thirty-nine articles, than of the canons of the council of Trent. It is poſſible that he may have derived his knowledge of the catholic tenets from a ſuſpicious and impure ſource, the writings of proteſtant controvertiſts. It is poſſible that education may have given a bias to his mind, and warped it with prejudice. It is poſſible that partiality for his own creed, a creed as bountiful to him as could have been the waters of Pactolus, may have taught him to view with a leſs friendly eye the creeds of others. However this may be, an adverſary cannot at the beſt be conſidered as the moſt unexceptionable witneſs; and a proteſtant prelate, how ſplendid ſoever may be his talents, may, without offence, be challenged as an unſafe expoſitor of the catholic doctrine. The clergyman is, notwithſtanding, of a contrary opinion. He ſturdily maintains the infallibility of his biſhop, repels with indignation the very ſuſpicion of ignorance or illiberality, and oppoſes with pious officiouſneſs his cobweb ſhield to the ſpear of the remarker.

I have often conſidered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the hiſtory of the human mind,

that in England the catholics are not allowed the faculty of underſtanding their own belief. Of the myriads of declaimers againſt popery, with whom this iſland abounds, from the unlettered female who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nurſery, to the right reverend divine who inſtructs his brethren the clergy of his dioceſe, there is not one who does not appear to claim a more accurate knowledge of the catholic doctrine than the very catholics themſelves. Their deciſions are more infallible than thoſe of the Roman pontiff. It is in vain that we diſclaim the odious tenets which they impute to us; in vain that we appeal to our profeſſions of faith, and the canons of our councils: our complaints are diſregarded, and our proteſtations treated with contempt: the obſtinacy of our adverſaries will neither yield to argument or authority: Objections, which have been a thouſand times refuted, are confidently brought forward as demonſtrations of our folly and impiety; and the miſrepreſentations of prejudice are eagerly received with the veneration due to ſimple unvarniſhed truth.

In the preſent inſtance, however, the biſhop's apologiſt has condeſcended to acknowledge that the author of the remarks may have been acquainted with the creed of his own church; but this acknowledgement is coupled with an inſinuation more inſulting and illiberal than could have been the denial itſelf. Aſſuming to himſelf the prerogative of him who ſearches the reins and heart, he accuſes the remarker of artifice, inſincerity, and fraud. "His conſcience," he boldly affirms, "bore witneſs to the accuracy of the biſhop's charge. His object was to diſguiſe the truth from the eyes of the public; and, as he was a diſciple of the doctrine which teaches that the end conſecrates the means, he had adopted

ſtratagems proſcribed by the laws of literary warfare." (*b*) Language ſuch as this, the remarker certainly will not honour with a reply. He would ſay with the poet :—

> A moral, ſenſible, and well bred man
> Will not affront me, and no other can.

If abuſe can ever prove an uſeful auxiliary, it can only be in the abſence of argument. It may, indeed, help to conceal the weak ſide of a bad cauſe; but muſt injure and diſgrace a good one. Yet I may be allowed to aſk what poſſible motive the remarker could have to diſguiſe the doctrines of his church at the expenſe of ſincerity and truth? Was it that he was ſenſible they could not be maintained by argument? But, in that ſuppoſition, why ſhould he rather diſguiſe than renounce them? I know of no motive that can bind a catholic clergyman to his faith, but the conviction of its truth. His mind cannot be influenced by gratitude for paſt favours, or by the hope of future preferment. The catholic church has not, like the eſtabliſhed church in this kingdom, rich and eaſy livings to beſtow on her champions: ſhe cannot invite them, after the heat of the conteſt, to repoſe in the lap of wealth and indolence. Was it that he was aſhamed to avow his real belief? I can ſee no reaſon for ſuch ſhame. His belief is not the belief of a ſingle nation, nor of the growth of a few years. It is the belief of the great majority of Chriſtians. It is, and for centuries has been, the belief of learned and poliſhed nations; the belief of ſcholars, philoſophers, and divines; generals, ſtateſmen, and princes. (*c*) Proudly as I may

(*b*) Clergyman's Letter, p. 7, 30, 41, 42.

(*c*) "Catholicity, which has been this night the subject of so much abuse, has been the belief of the most extensive and enlight-

think of my own country, I cannot yet perſuade myſelf that intellectual excellence is excluſively confined to this iſland: and when I look on the continent, and view the populous nations which there profeſs the catholic faith,—when I look back into paſt ages, and behold millions of men, during a long ſeries of generations, reckoning it as their pride and their happineſs, I can ſmile at the invectives of its adverſaries, and deſpiſe the diſgrace which is heaped upon it here.

I am well aware of the daring and adventurous ſpirit of controverſy. I know that in the eager purſuit of victory it is not to be appalled by ordinary difficulties; that in the hope of ſubduing an opponent, it will heedleſsly endanger its own ſecurity. But there are ſome objects to which no religious diſputant ought to be indifferent; and to vindicate the truth of Chriſtianity muſt certainly be as important a duty as to cruſh the corruptions of popery. Now it has always appeared to me no eaſy matter to reconcile the opinions of theſe reverend and right reverend theologians with the avowed object of Chriſt's miſſion, or the real nature of the goſpel diſpenſation. For what end did "the mighty God, the equal of the Father, the Lord of all things, both in heaven and earth," aſſume the lowly nature of man, ſuffer the diſgraceful death of the croſs, and atone for the ſins of mankind? Was it merely to ſcatter the ſeeds of a pure and celeſtial religion among the nations, to watch over its increaſe till it had ſpread through the Roman empire, and then to ſuffer it to wither away and die? Was it to eſtabliſh, "not a glorious church, without ſpot or wrin-

ened nations in Europe, and of the most illustrious characters that ever did honour to the name of man."—*Speech of Lord Hutchinson in the House of Lords, May* 10, 1805. *Cuthell, p.* 110.

kle, holy and without ſtain," but a church which ſhould ſpeedily revive the ſuperſtition and idolatry that he had ſo much laboured to extinguiſh? Was it to offer to his Father, not "a choſen generation, a royal prieſthood, a holy nation, a purchaſed people, who ſhould ſhew forth his praiſes," but a race of men, enemies to the purity of his worſhip, patrons of religious ignorance, and derogators from the honour of the Father, from the mediatorſhip of the Son, and from the ſanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit? Whoever will conſider the remote antiquity and wide diffuſion of the catholic faith, will acknowledge that theſe conſequences appear to flow from the accuſations preferred in the biſhop's charge; and if they do, where, I aſk, are the invaluable bleſſings which Chriſtianity has conferred on mankind? Where the promiſes of Chriſt that his church ſhould be built on a rock, and that the gates of hell ſhould not prevail againſt it? In my opinion, and that is alſo the opinion of many eminent proteſtants, to aſcribe ſuch abſurdities and impiety to the great body of chriſtians during ſo many centuries, is to queſtion the truth of the goſpel, to libel the veracity of Chriſt, and to aid the infidel in his attempts to undermine the very foundations of our holy religion. (*d*)

(*d*) The clergyman, in a note, (p. 11,) protests against our taking the name of Catholics—I should have thought, that the prescription of so many centuries would have given us as clear a title to the name of Catholics, as our adversaries can have to that of Protestants. As the English church has not had the presumption, like the magnanimous parent of the reformation, to insert in the creed the *holy christian church*, instead of the *holy catholic church*, I trust the clergyman will acknowledge that such a church somewhere exists. Now if it be not our church, I would ask him what church it is. Is it the collection of sects which have sprung from the reformation? But then it would not be catholic. For as they are the smaller number, they cannot claim an universality, which they would deny to us, though incomparably more numerous. Does he conceive that it is a theological hodge podge, a farrago of all the

These preliminary remarks will not, it is hoped, be deemed less interesting than the polite insinuations which occupy the first and last pages of the clergyman's letter: and may, perhaps, induce the impartial reader to suspend his assent to the confident assertions of our adversaries, till he has heard what we may say in our own defence. I shall now proceed to the matter-of-fact enquiry. The right reverend prelate had drawn up his bill of impeachment with all the formality and accuracy of an attorney general. It was divided into three heads, and each head contained several different counts. As both the remarker and his opponent have followed the order laid down by the bishop, I shall not think myself at liberty to deviate from it. Each observation of any importance I shall discuss with patience: minor exceptions I shall neglect. To reply to them would swell this pamphlet beyond its natural size. An objection may be compressed within a single line: its refutation may demand several pages.

1. The first charge is idolatry: a charge as old as the reformation; but which has been long since abandoned and ridiculed by the more candid and moderate of our opponents. To the bishop of Durham, Elijah Index, and the clergyman of the diocese of Durham, we may oppose the more respectable names of Thorndike and Grotius, of bishop Parker and bishop Montague (*e*). Were their respective

religions which believe in the gospel? Then it cannot be holy; for we should form the principal part of it; and our doctrines, he knows, are so far from being holy, that they are impious and idolatrous, derogatory from the honour of God the Father, from the mediatorship of God the Son, and from the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. I think then he had better leave us in the quiet possession of our old inheritance.

(*e*) I will add Mr Thorndike's argument. It is obscure but solid. "They which profess the only true Christ, and therefore the only

merits to be weighed in the balance, our modern accusers would, I suspect, fly up and kick the beam, though they were to take with them as make-weights the book of homilies and the statute of Charles the second (*f*). In his charge the bishop made, but did not take the trouble to prove, the accusation. The author of the remarks was content in reply to refer him to the following question and answer in the catholic catechism. Q. "*Do catholics pray to images?*" A. "*No, by no means, for they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us.*" He had flattered himself that the testimony of an authorised catechism would have subdued the scepticism of the most incredulous. But he was disappointed. The prejudices of education are stubborn things: they frequently refuse to yield even to the clearest evidence. The dispute is not to be decided, replies the Durham clergyman, by an answer which may be given by rote, but by the practice of those who give it. Now this answer appears to me no very favourable sample of his boasted sincerity. I should rather consider it as the trick of a controversial juggler, the artifice of some theological Proteus,

Mille adde catenas
Effugiet tamen hæc sceleratus vincula Proteus.

Few of my readers will, I conceive, be inclined to think that any church can teach her disciples to

true God, do necessarily profess to detest all idolatary. And so doth the church of Rome still as seriously profess, as they who charge them to bee idolaters. And therefore cannot easily bee convinced to profess idolatry. For without expressly renouncing this profession, they cannot expressly bee idolaters." *Just Weights*, p. 6. Hence he infers: "Should this church (as the bishop of Durham has done) declare that the change which we call reformation, is grounded on this supposition, I then must acknowledge that we bee the schismatics." p. 7.

(*f*) Homily 2. on the peril of idolatry, 30 *Charles* ii. c. 1.

believe one doctrine in theory and to follow the contrary in practice; can lance her anathemas againſt thoſe who approve, and yet countenance the conduct of thoſe who adopt, the idolatrous worſhip of images. An ingenuous opponent would rather have ſaid, "I acknowledge that your church condemns idolatry as forcibly as our own: nor have I yet diſcovered any traces of that impiety among the catholics of this country. Yet, if we may believe the teſtimony of travellers there is reaſon to fear that foreign catholics cannot be entirely exempted from the imputation." To ſuch an opponent I would anſwer, that in the teſtimony of travellers much muſt be allowed to the prejudices of education: That a perſon who leaves this country with the conviction that catholics worſhip images, will naturally conclude that the firſt catholic whom he ſees kneeling before a crucifix, is addreſſing his prayers not to Chriſt but to the image: that in foreign countries expreſſions and demonſtrations of reſpect have not the ſame value or import as in England: and that if ſome ſhould be found, whoſe conduct it would be difficult to juſtify, yet candour would forbid that their guilt ſhould be imputed to thoſe by whom it is abhorred and condemned. Where are ſuperſtitions more prevalent, than among the vulgar in many parts of England? Yet he would be an unjuſt critic, who ſhould impute them as a crime to the eſtabliſhed clergy.

The incredulity of the Durham clergyman has induced me to examine with greater accuracy the contents of the catholic catechiſms. With this view I have conſulted not only thoſe which are in uſe among the Engliſh catholics, but alſo many of thoſe which are adopted in France, Spain, Italy, Flanders, and Germany: and in all without exception have I

found every ſpecies of idolatry condemned in the moſt pointed terms. Now if he will conſider the earneſtneſs with which the catholic clergy are generally accuſtomed to impreſs on the minds of children the doctrine of the catechiſm, the familiar manner in which they ſtudy to explain it, and the diligence with which they repeat their inſtructions every week, and often ſeveral times in the week, I think he will be induced to pauſe before he again ventures to charge catholics with a practice, which they ſo emphatically reprobate. But from catechiſms let me lead him to an authority, which he cannot refuſe, to the decree of the council of Trent. He himſelf appears to acknowledge that he would free the catholics from the guilt of idolatry, were they exempt from the impious perſuaſion that there exiſts any inherent power or divinity in their images (*g*). Now in the very chapter to which he refers his reader, the council expreſsly declares that in images there does not reſide any divinity, or power on account of which they ought to be worſhipped: that nothing ought to be aſked from them; and that no confidence ſhould be placed in them (*h*). If this declaration do not ſatisfy him, I beg he will have the goodneſs to compoſe one for us more explicit and more intelligible.

Here, perhaps, it may not be improper to point out the origin of this accuſation. It is our doctrine that pious pictures and images ought not to be treated with diſreſpect under the falſe pretence that they are idols: and this doctrine, reprobated as it formerly was with contempt and deteſtation, is now, I

(*g*) The Clergyman's Letter, p. 11.

(*h*) Non quod credatur inesse aliqua in eis divinitas, vel virtus propter quam sint colendæ: vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum; vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda. *Con. Trid. Sess.* 25.

obſerve, gradually making its way into the creed of the eſtabliſhed church, in proportion as the fanaticiſm of the firſt reformers ſubſides, and reaſon and common ſenſe recover their authority. The piety of our fathers two centuries ago would have condemned the works of Raphael and Michael Angelo to the flames and the mattock, had they diſcovered them in their churches: but modern proteſtants have learned that they can pray in the preſence of a painting or a ſtatue without experiencing any impediment to their devotion, or any temptation to idolatry. It is unfortunate that ſimilar ſentiments did not animate their progenitors. We ſhould not now have to lament our inferiority in the elegant productions of the chiſel and the pencil; nor would our native artiſts be compelled to viſit foreign countries that they may ſtudy the maſter pieces of the painter and the ſtatuary. It is, indeed, true, that beſides the prohibition of diſreſpect, our church alſo maintains it to be lawful to treat them with reſpect, in as much as they are the repreſentations of our bleſſed Redeemer, and of his faithful followers: and this reſpect has been by our adverſaries, with as much injuſtice as ingenuity, tranſubſtantiated into an idolatrous worſhip. I could, however, wiſh they would, once at leaſt, inform us in what idolatry conſiſts. Is it in paying divine worſhip to images? Such worſhip we condemn as ſincerely as themſelves. The reſpect which we allow is of a much inferior, a very different, deſcription. It is the ſame as a ſubject may pay to the effigy of his ſovereign, ſuch as nature prompts a child to pay to the portrait of a deceaſed parent (*i*). Or is any reſpect whatever idolatrous?

(*i*) According to the council of Nice, τιμητικην προσκυνησιν, ου μεν την κατα πιστιν ημων αληθινην λατρειαν, η πρεπει μονη τη θειᾳ φυσει. Bin. con. Tom. v. p. 198.

Then the chriſtians of the eaſt were idolaters, when they were accuſtomed to burn incenſe before the ſtatues of the chriſtian emperors: the peers of the united kingdom are idolaters, as often as they make a reverence to the vacant throne: the proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed church are idolaters, as often as they kneel before the conſecrated bread and wine. For, what are the conſecrated bread and wine? "Mere bodily elements of earthly manufacture," replies the biſhop of Durham. But if the proteſtant may kneel before theſe "bodily elements of earthly manufacture" without committing idolatry, becauſe he directs his attention to the worſhip of God; I hope the catholic for the ſame reaſon may kneel before a crucifix of earthly manufacture, and be equally free from guilt. *With what judgment ye judge, ye ſhall be judged: and with what meaſure ye mete, it ſhall be meaſured to you again* (*k*).

I ſhall moreover obſerve, that in the ſacred writings occur many inſtances of a reſpect paid to inanimate objects, which cannot, without impiety, be termed idolatrous. Thus, in the Old Teſtament,

(*k*) I ſhall here add the opinion of Biſhop Montague. "The pictures of Chriſt, the bleſſed virgin and ſaints, may be made, had in houſes, ſet up in churches. The proteſtants use them: they deſpight them not. Reſpect and honour may be given unto them. The proteſtants do it, and use them for helps of piety." *Gagger*, p. 318. In almoſt every language the words which denote veneration and reſpect, are of ambiguous ſignification, and their purport muſt frequently be fixed by the nature of the object and the intention of the agent. Thus 1 Chron. xxix. 20. it is ſaid that all the congregation *worſhipped* God and the king. Now this ambiguity has furniſhed an ample field for the invectives of our adverſaries. As *to worſhip* is now generally confined to the honour due to the Divine Being, many controverſialiſts argue as if it had never had any other meaning: yet ſome veſtiges of its ancient ſignification ſtill remain in the title of worſhipful, which we give to magiſtrates, and in the marriage ceremony, when the huſband addreſſes the bride with theſe ſolemn words,—*With my body I thee worſhip.*

God commanded Moſes to walk barefoot on Mount Horeb, becauſe *it was holy ground.* From the period of the fabrication of the ark to the time in which it was placed in the temple, we have ſeveral inſtances of the reſpect which the Iſraelites were ordered to bear it, and of the ſevere puniſhments which God inflicted on thoſe who either touched it or looked on it with irreverence or inattention. Yet what was this ark, the object of ſo much veneration to the children of Iſrael? A ſquare cheſt of wood, in which were contained the tables of the law, and perhaps the rod of Aaron, and the golden pot of manna. In the New Teſtament, we are commanded to bow the knee at the name of Jeſus; and in the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, and the eighteenth canon of the ſecond year of James I., it is ordered, that "at the name of Jeſus due reverence be made of all perſons, young and old, with lowneſs of courteſie and uncovering of the heads of mankind, as thereunto doth neceſſarily belong." (*l*) Now it will, in my opinion, require ſome ingenuity to explain, why it ſhould be a *duty* to bow when I hear the ſound of his name, and a *crime* to bow when I ſee the repreſentation of his ſufferings. In both inſtances the real object of my reſpect is the ſame,—the only difference is in the organ of perception. In the former the ear is affected by the motion of the fluid, which is the vehicle of ſound; in the latter the eye is affected by the impulſe of the rays of light. By both I mean to honour the Redeemer of mankind; and if the firſt mode be lawful and pious, the other cannot be unlawful and impious.

In oppoſition to this doctrine, our matter-of-fact

(*l*) Wilkin's Con. vol. iv. p. 188, 382.

enquirer adduces, what he conſiders as a matter of fact, that ſome among the moſt celebrated divines of the church of Rome, Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Cajetan, aſſert the higheſt kind of adoration, *latria*, to be due to the images of God. (*m*) Were this really the caſe, it would not invalidate the doctrine which I have laid down in the preceding pages. I have undertaken to vindicate the creed of the catholic church, not to juſtify all the extravagant opinions which may have been hazarded by ingenious men in her communion. If he expect this from me, I hope he will alſo, on his ſide, accept the office of vindicating a ſmall portion of the impious, impure, and immoral doctrines advanced and taught, not by private divines, but by the magnanimous fathers of the reformation. We ſhould neither of us have a very pleaſant, or a very eaſy taſk. However, in the preſent inſtance, the catholic writers, whom he has impeached, ſtand not in need of any apology. The doctrine which, from his language, we ſhould expect to find in their works, was moſt foreign from their real belief. I do not accuſe his ſincerity: inattention, perhaps, to the purport of their language, or zeal for the honour of his biſhop, or, what is ſtill more probable, confidence in the aſſertions of ſome former controverſialiſt, prompted him to miſrepreſent their doctrine. If then, in my attempt to explain it, I lead the reader among the metaphyſical ſubtleties of the ancient ſchoolmen, the blame, I truſt, will not attach to me, but to him who has impoſed the obligation on me.

To illuſtrate their meaning, it will, perhaps, be

(*m*) Clergyman's Letter, p. 13. I ſhall take no advantage of his miſtake in inſerting *God* inſtead of *Chriſt*. It is not even agreed among catholic divines whether it be lawful to make images or repreſentations of God.

moſt convenient to employ a compariſon. It will probably be conceded to me, that a huſband may feel a ſincere affection for his wife, and conſequently may entertain a regard for her picture. Now let us ſuppoſe two idle logicians, fond of wrangling, undertake to diſcuſs the real nature of this affection and this regard. One of them ſhall maintain that they are of different natures, as the affection has for its object an animate, the regard an inanimate being. The other, with equal pertinacity, ſhall contend, that they may be ſaid to be both of the ſame nature, becauſe of both, though the immediate object be different, the ultimate object is the ſame: both are ultimately referred to the wife. The reader may ſmile at theſe ſubtleties, but I truſt he will not thence infer that the ſecond reaſoner conſidered the picture as of equal value with the lady, or that he was a friend to conjugal infidelity. Now this is a caſe in point: it is preciſely the diſpute of the old ſchoolmen. One party contended that as the worſhip of Chriſt and reſpect for his image or picture had two different immediate objects, they were of two different natures. Their opponents contended that as both were ultimately referred to the ſame object, Chriſt, they might both be ſaid to be of the ſame nature. This was the important ſubject of the diſpute. The reader may ſmile, or lament that ingenious men ſhould give their attention to ſuch trifles, but certainly he will not infer that the patrons of the latter opinion conſidered the image of Chriſt as equally worthy of adoration with Chriſt himſelf, or that they taught and enforced the practice of idolatry. As to the impiety of worſhipping Chriſt and his repreſentation in the ſame manner, both parties were agreed. Their debate was about words, not things;

and they never could have ſuſpected that theſe metaphyſical ſubtleties could have expoſed them to ſo ſevere and unmerited an imputation. (*n*)—Truſting that what I have already ſaid will prove ſatisfactory to every unprejudiced judge, I ſhall here cloſe this ſubject with the obſervation of the learned proteſtant divine, Mr Thorndike:—*Let not them (who charge the papiſts to be idolaters) lead the people by the noſe, to believe that they can prove their ſuppoſition when they cannot.* (*o*)

It is with conſiderable reluctance that I proceed to the next accuſation. For the honour of its author, I wiſh I could paſs it over unnoticed. Diſgraceful as it muſt prove to us if it be true: ſtill more diſgraceful will it be to him, if it be falſe. I do not impeach his ſincerity; but if on the word of

(*n*) The Clergyman's quotation from Bellarmine (p. 13) merely evinces the great anxiety of that divine to prevent even metaphyſical diſputes, which might be the occaſion of error to the unlearned.

(*o*) Juſt Weights, p. 11.

The Clergyman (p. 14) produces a few texts from ſcripture with an air of triumph. Seldom, perhaps, were theſe ſacred volumes more palpably miſapplied. In Iſaiah, xl. the prophet deſcribes the power of God in the deliverance of his people from the Babylonian captivity, and then aſks, To whom they can liken him? The artiſts of Babylon could make repreſentations of their gods, but what likeneſs could repreſent the omnipotent and eternal God of Iſrael? And this text is gravely adduced to prove that it is unlawful to make a repreſentation of Chriſt hanging on the croſs! The paſſages from St Paul are equally irrelevant. That from Acts xvii. 29, is thus paraphraſed by the learned Dr Hammond:—"God cannot be ſuppoſed to be the work of our hands, ſuch as a piece of gold, or ſilver, or ſtone, with a ſignature upon it. Hammond, hic—He tells us (p. 15) that we are like the pagans, many of whom through their idols worſhipped the great maker of the world. This may be ſo; but then we muſt acknowledge that St Paul was not inſpired, when he aſſerted that the things which the Gentiles ſacrificed, they ſacrificed to *devils* and *not to God*. 1 Cor. x. 20. See alſo p. 106, v. 37. The Durham clergyman may alſo, if he pleaſe, adore the divinity of Jupiter, whom he conceives to be the true God, I ſhall be content with the divine being deſcribed to us in the ſacred writings. As for Julian, he lived after St Paul, had been a chriſtian, and endeavoured to ſoften the harſher features of paganiſm.

another he publiſh a calumny to the world, he muſt ſubmit to take the odium on himſelf. I am not to ſit down in ſilence under a falſe accuſation, leſt the proof of my innocence ſhould reflect on the character of my accuſer. The biſhop charges the catholic clergy with having ſuppreſſed the ſecond commandment in books of religious inſtitution, that they might diſguiſe the repugnance of their idolatrous worſhip to the letter of the decalogue. (*b*) This is certainly a charge of no ordinary conſequence. If the catholic clergy plead guilty, they muſt acknowledge themſelves traitors to that God, whoſe miniſters they are, and traitors to the people, whom it is their duty to inſtruct. They have corrupted the laws of their ſovereign, and have put it out of the power of the people to diſcover their diſobedience. Fortunately for us, unfortunately for his lordſhip, the accuſation is as abſurd in itſelf, as it is unfounded in fact. One falſehood is aſſumed to give an air of plauſibility to another. The crime of idolatry is taken as proved, and on this imaginary baſis is built the charge of the ſuppreſſion. I would aſk the right reverend prelate by what authority the commandment was ſuppreſſed? By the bull of ſome pope, or the decree of ſome council? Then let him name it, if he can. By private conſent? But private conſent, in a body ſo widely extended as the catholic clergy, is impoſſible. What advantage did they expect from this ſuppreſſion? Would it juſtify their idolatry? No, it would aggravate its guilt. Would it conceal their impiety? From whom could it conceal it? Not from their adverſaries, who would be eager to reproach them with it. Not from the more learned of their own communion,

(*b*) Biſhop's Charge, p. 6, firſt edit.

who would thus be taught to execrate their hypocriſy; but only from the more illiterate of the people, the very claſs from whom they had the leaſt oppoſition to apprehend. How could they ſuppreſs it? Certainly by no other method than by expunging it from every bible, from every prayer-book, and from every catechiſm: in a word, to uſe the biſhop's expreſſion, from every book of the religious inſtitution. For if they had left it in any, the fraud muſt have been diſcovered, and muſt have expoſed them to the indignation and contempt of the public. Now it ſo happens that theſe bungling politicians have left it in every edition of the bible; and even in every catechiſm and every prayer-book which profeſſes to explain the commandments at length.—Let the biſhop of Durham, let any of my readers conſult ſuch books of catholic inſtitution as they can procure, and they will be compelled to acknowledge the truth of this aſſertion.

After the firſt edition of the biſhop's charge, the remarker gently admoniſhed him of his miſtake.—Whether his Lordſhip thought it worth his while to enquire into the truth or falſehood of the admonition, I know not: but two editions of his work have ſince been publiſhed, and the accuſation ſtill ſtands unbluſhingly in its original form. Some proteſtant writers, however, have made the experiment, which was recommended, and the reſult has been a conviction, which they have publicly expreſſed, of our innocence. But evidence, which may be deemed ſatisfactory in other parts of the kingdom, is condemned to loſe its force in the dioceſe of Durham. Prejudice appears to have drawn a migic circle around us, impermeable to the rays of truth. Firſt our Jewiſh friend Elijah, and next the Durham clergyman have come forward

to ſubſtantiate the juſtice of the accuſation. Elijah periſhed by his own weapon, and died a felo de ſe. The clergyman approaches with a load of erudition, but which is of little ſervice to his cauſe, and of leſs to his "ſincerity." His pamphlet bears ſufficient teſtimony that he had conſulted with no ordinary degree of diligence, catholic books of religious inſtitution, not only thoſe of eaſy acceſs, but alſo thoſe which for near two centuries have been neglected and forgotten. He has told us that in four catholic books, which I ſhall notice below, (*q*) he did not find the exact words of the ſecond commandment: but he has not told us in how many he did find them. I will, however, for once appeal to his boaſted ſincerity: and will venture to aſſert, that if he have the courage to ſpeak the truth, he muſt acknowledge, that for one catholic book in which he did not read the words in queſtion, he diſcovered twenty in which he did. I will alſo tell

(*q*) In the note he appears to have discovered, after a long and painful search, seven books, in which the express words of the sacred text are wanting: but, as of these four are only different editions or translations of the same treatise, I may reduce them to the number mentioned above. One of these is entitled Officium B. Mariæ Virginis, at the commencement of which the printer, of his own authority, added a small tract of three pages, called Institutio Hominis Christiani, in which occurs an abstract of the decalogue, without the prohibition in express words of idol-worship. The other three books are catechisms by Vaux, Ledesma, and Du Roy, names that I dare assert not one catholic in a thousand has heard of before. Vaux was an Englishman, an exile for his faith, and a schoolmaster in Germany: he composed and published a catechism in 1567. He does not indeed give the very words of what protestants call the second commandment, but he refers to them Exod. c. xx. informs us that all idolatry is prohibited, and that the reverence which may lawfully be given to the images of Christ and his saints, is the same as that which we give to parents, superiors, and other reverend persons. The catechisms of Ledesma and Du Roy I have not been able to procure. They are, probably, as free from all just reason of censure. To these he might have added an Irish prayer-book, in which the words are omitted: yet the same prayer-book forbids all kind of idolatry.

him in what books he or any of his friends may read them. They may read them in every edition of the bible that has been printed by catholics, in any language. They may read them in the different authorised catechisms to which I have referred in the note below (*r*): and they may also read them in almost every catholic book of popular instruction.

Here I may be allowed to ask two questions. 1. By what system of casuistry can a sincere and ingenuous adversary reconcile it with his conscience to accuse a church of suppressing a particular doctrine, because, though he has discovered it in the majority, he has not discovered it in a few, of the books written by members of her communion? 2. By what laws of reasoning can a fair disputant attempt to shew that a church endeavours to conceal a doctrine from the eyes of the people, when she publishes it in almost every book, which she exhorts them to read? It must be evident that, if the words of the commandment are not fully expressed in every catechism, the omission cannot be justly attributed to the cause which it has pleased the zeal of our adversaries to assign: and that they may not in future be obliged to plead their ignorance as an excuse, I hope they will have no objection to learn the true reason. It is well known that for many centuries before the birth of the reformation, the catholics were accustomed to arrange, on the authority of St Augustine, the decalogue in such manner,

(*r*) Catechismus Romanus, part. 3. Institutiones Christianæ pietatis a Petro Canisio. (To this Vaux was much indebted.) Catechismo di Napoli, par. 3. The Flemish catechisms: Christelyke leering voor de Catholycke jonkeyt, p. 30. Christelyke onderwizing, p. 167. The German catechism, Catholischer Catechismus, Hamburgh, 1769. The French catechisms, de Montpellier, des Eveques, de Meaux, or that lately published for the use of the French empire. The English catechisms, &c. If these be not sufficient to convince him, I will furnish him with fifty more.

that whatever regarded the worſhip of God ſhould be compriſed under one diviſion. Thus, what proteſtants call the firſt and ſecond commandments, we call the firſt. The relative merit of the two diviſions is foreign to the preſent ſubject. I merely ſtate the caſe. Now as children among catholics are taught the catechiſm almoſt as ſoon as they begin to liſp, it was thought adviſeable to abridge the commandments for their uſe, ſo that each precept ſhould be confined to one line, which generally is in rhyme. The commandment in queſtion was expreſſed in theſe or ſimilar words. *One God alone thou ſhalt adore.* Now it is evident, that here can be no intention of ſuppreſſing the prohibition of idolatry. 1. Becauſe even theſe words prohibit it: 2. Becauſe as the children grew up, they were compelled to learn the larger catechiſm, in which the commandments are repeated at full length, and the prohibition is carefully enforced in the queſtions and anſwers. It is tedious to be ſo diffuſe upon trifles.—Had the accuſation been made by ſome obſcure controverſialiſt, I ſhould have treated it with the neglect it deſerved: but it derives importance from the dignity of its author, and from the repeated though feeble efforts of his apologiſts. It was therefore a duty to diſplay our own innocence, and to remind our adverſaries, that beſides the prohibition of idolatry, the decalogue contains another precept: *Thou ſhalt not bear falſe witneſs againſt thy neighbour* (*s*).

(*s*) Page 17 is beneath criticism. The Durham clergyman seems to be alarmed with the consciousness that he has undertaken a weak cause. His imagination is perpetually conjuring up spectres to affright him. At every step he fancies himself caught in a trap laid by his crafty adversary. The bishop had said: "To disguise such repugnance to the letter of God's commandment, an artifice was adopted, &c." To what did *such repugnance* refer? To the practice of catholics. Where then was the dishonest expedient to make the bishop say, that the practice of catholics was repugnant

In the progreſs of his reaſoning, the biſhop's antipathy to the catholic faith drew from him an argument, at which candour and liberality would bluſh. The remarker diſdained to give it a direct anſwer, but hurled it back with contempt to his opponents. If it were concluſive, it would undermine the whole fabric of the eſtabliſhed church: he therefore deſired them to ſolve it themſelves. The attempt has been made. Elijah made it, and ended by abjuring the Athanaſian creed. (*t*) The clergyman endeavours to improve the argument by illuſtration, and his illuſtration has expoſed it in all its nakedneſs. He ſtates it in this manner:—"We cannot be ſurpriſed that thoſe who believe bread and wine to be the real body and blood of Chriſt, that is, truly God, and deſerving divine worſhip, as ſuch, ſhould likewiſe, without much difficulty, believe, that an image may partake of the divine nature of Chriſt, and may therefore deſerve, as ſuch, the worſhip due to God; that if the body and blood of Chriſt may ſubſiſt under the accidents of bread and wine, they may alſo ſubſiſt under the accidents of carven wood, or molten braſs." To refute ſuch empty reaſoning is of itſelf an humiliation. Without adverting to the inaccuracy of the expreſſion in the firſt part of the argument, it may be ſufficient to reply:—That we believe the body and blood of Chriſt to ſubſiſt under the accidents or appearances of bread and wine, becauſe he has

to the letter of God's commandment? The clergyman says that the biſhop *does* not found his cenſure on that ground. I am happy to learn it. Our doctrine then is *now* confeſſed not to be contrary to the letter of the commandment. But he *did* found his cenſure on that ground: and if he did not think it repugnant to the letter of the commandment, why did he aſſert that we had ſuppreſſed the commandment in order to conceal its repugnance to the letter.

(*t*) A Proteſtant's Reply, p. 10.

expreſsly aſſerted that they do: but that he has not aſſerted that they ſubſiſt under the accidents or appearances, of carven wood, or molten braſs. What reaſon then can we have to worſhip either carven wood or molten braſs?

The clergyman proceeds to ſhew that the argument, as retorted by the remarker, does not apply to the right reverend prelate. I muſt acknowledge, that in this part of his pamphlet I ſhould have more admired, not only his powers of reaſoning, but alſo his ſincerity, had he not "adopted an artifice, proſcribed by the laws of literary warfare." The three whole pages which he devotes to the ſolution of the difficulty, do not even remotely refer to it. They indeed prove, that the belief of the divinity of Chriſt is no ſuperſtition, which the remarker did not diſpute; but they do not prove that any anſwer can be given to the unitarian by the proteſtant, which, in the mouth of a catholic, will not be equally powerful againſt the biſhop. I ſhall, therefore, take the liberty briefly to reſtate the argument of the remarker, and to ſolicit an anſwer from ſome of the admirers of the charge. If to believe that the body and blood of Chriſt can ſubſiſt under the appearances of bread and wine, neceſſarily diſpoſe the catholic to worſhip the creature-image inſtead of the creator; it follows that to believe the divinity exiſted on earth with a body made of the ſame fleſh, and ſubject to the ſame infirmities as our own, muſt alſo diſpoſe the proteſtant to worſhip the creature-image inſtead of the creator. If the biſhop or his apologiſt reply by proving the divinity of Chriſt, I hope they will alſo approve of the anſwer which I have given in the preceding paragraph. If they prefer any other mode of reaſoning, I will pledge myſelf to ſhew that it

will equally furnish a solution of the argument employed by the prelate against the catholics. (*u*)

With a light and indulgent hand the author of the remarks had ventured to touch an ancient sore, the established doctrine on the subject of the Lord's supper. His sacrilegious temerity has alarmed the piety, and provoked the indignation of my opponent. That learned clerk seems to fancy that the catholic tenets alone are fair and open game. At them every hungry or ill-natured divine, every hunter after favour and preferment, may direct the shafts of ridicule and misrepresentation. It is one of the graces of the reformation; an appendage to the liberty of the children of God. But the doctrines approved in the thirty-nine articles are sacred things. If a catholic writer presume to enter the veil of the sanctuary, to draw them out of their obscurity, and exhibit them in their native colours, a thousand

(*u*) The Clergyman denies that the scripture is as clear for transubstantiation as for the divinity of Christ. This is, I fear, a shuffle. What the remarker contended for was the real presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist: when once that is settled, it will be time enough to decide whether it be there by transubstantiation or by any other means. Till this be done, I will, with his permission, undertake to produce texts as evident in favour of the real presence, as he shall produce in favour of the divinity of Christ. As to the assertion that the belief of the divinity of Christ is very different from a tenet, which is contradicted by the evidence of the senses, and can be proved to be true only by destroying the foundations of our assent to all truth, I ask whether the divinity of our Saviour was not contradictory to the evidence of the senses? The Clergyman proves that he was God, not from the immediate testimony of sense, but by arguing from his actions and declarations, that though in appearance he was man, yet he also was God. In like manner, do we not argue from the words of our Saviour, that though the eucharist be in appearance bread and wine, yet in reality it is the body and blood of Christ? If I perfectly understand my opponent, I should not doubt that, had he been present at the baptism of Jesus, he would not have believed in the descent of the Holy Ghost over his sacred person, lest he should destroy the foundations of our assent to all truth. He perhaps never learned that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."—*Rom.* x. 17

arms are raiſed to laſh his arrogance and impiety. The remarker had obſerved that the proteſtant doctrine on the Lord's ſupper, appeared to his judgement ſomething like nonſenſe. It was, indeed, a harſh expreſſion; but I do not conceive that it could offend the ears of thoſe, who ſo liberally beſtow the terms of abſurdity, ſuperſtition, and idolatry, on their adverſaries. Neither do I think that it were very difficult to vindicate the propriety of his language. Let us go to the catechiſm, which the Durham clergyman is ſuppoſed to teach, and to the thirty-nine articles, which he has ſubſcribed. The catechiſm is meant for the uſe of children; we may, therefore, conclude that it is accommodated to the weakneſs of their capacity, and drawn up in plain and perſpicuous language. Now in this catechiſm we are taught "that the body and blood of Chriſt are verily and indeed received by the faithful in the Lord's ſupper." May I then aſk, whether the body and blood of Chriſt be there, or not? They are not, replies my opponent; nothing more is received than the graces, which Chriſt's ſacrificed body can yield us. Now I appeal to any perſon acquainted with the Engliſh language, whether to receive Chriſt's body and blood *verily* and *indeed*, can naturally mean any other thing than to receive it in very truth and deed; (*v*) and whether the remarker committed a very egregious blunder when he aſſerted

(*v*) "The declaration against transubstantiation, says the Annual Review, is yet extorted from members of the house of commons, although the church of England consecrates that doctrine by maintaining that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received by the faithful at the Lord's supper. This may be called consubstantiation by Lutheran sophistry: but it only removes the transubstantiation of the sacramental elements from the chalice of the priest to the mouth of the communicant. We comprehend not, how any evangelical christian, or sincere member of the church of England, can assent to this declaration without feeling the remorse of perjury."—Review for 1806, p. 565, 566.

that to receive in the Lord's ſupper, in very truth and deed, that which was acknowledged not to be in the Lord's ſupper, appeared to his judgment ſomething like nonſenſe. But from the catechiſm let us proceed to the articles. Had the biſhops and doctors, to whoſe learning and ingenuity we owe them, been poſſeſſed of the clear preceptions of the Durham clergyman, they would have told us that the inſtrumental cauſe, by which we are put in actual poſſeſſion of *all* the graces which Chriſt's crucified body can yield us, is given, taken, and eaten, in the Lord's ſupper. This doctrine, whither it be true or falſe, would at leaſt have had the merit of being intelligible. But they, poor ſouls, went a more awkward way to work; they were like the man,

> ——Who now to ſense, now nonsense leaning,
> Means not, but blunders round about a meaning.

They thought it beſt to declare that the body of Chriſt is given, taken, and eaten, in the ſupper, only after an heavenly and ſpiritual manner, and the mean whereby it is received and eaten is faith. Now, that the body of Chriſt is given, taken, and eaten, in the ſupper, only after a heavenly and ſpiritual manner, is the doctrine of catholics, and neceſſarily flows from our belief in the real preſence: for though his body be reall, there, it is only there after a ſpiritual and heavenly manner. But this cannot be the true meaning of the article; and to underſtand it, we muſt conceive "the body of Chriſt" to be a metaphorical expreſſion for the "graces which his body can yield us." The mean whereby the body is received and eaten is faith. This appears to me equally unintelligible. Whatever may be underſtood by faith (I ſuſpect it to be an aſſurance of ſalvation, and then fanatics

only will receive the graces of Chriſt's body), it is evident from it that the unfaithful do not eat the body of Chriſt. Now if this had been the doctrine of the apoſtle, I ſuſpect he would not have ſaid, that the unworthy communicant is *guilty*, but that he is *deprived* of the body and blood of Chriſt. (*w*) This at leaſt, will, I truſt, be conceded to me, that no man could, from the mere peruſal of the article, deduce either what then was, or now is, the real doctrine of the eſtabliſhed church. Whence then, I may perhaps be aſked, did this obſcurity ariſe? Was it intentional or unintentional? Had the framers of the articles no fixed notions on the ſubject, or did they differ in their reſpective ſentiments? If I might be allowed to reveal the ſcandalous ſecret, I would ſay that the whole buſineſs was a mere politico-theological juggle. The fathers of the reformation could agree in repudiating the catholic creed: they could not agree in any other to ſubſtitute in its place. Truth is one: it is the centre of the circle; recede from it, and you may wander to any point of the circumference. The new doctors, in the pride of evangelical liberty, believed one day one thing, and another day another; and as men and circumſtances changed, the creed of the Engliſh church was improved or corrupted by ſucceſſive alterations. The firſt book of common-prayer was a work of Godly travail: the commons, lords, and infant head of the church, pronounced it to have been compoſed with the aid of the Holy Ghoſt; (*x*)

(*w*) On this ſubject I will refer the reader to biſhop Beveridge's explanation of the catechiſm, p. 145. It is amuſing enough to obſerve with what ingenuity the right reverend prelate gradually ſlides through three pages from the body and blood of Chriſt, till he at laſt reſts on a ſecure ſtanding place, the graces of the body and blood of Chriſt.

(*x*) 2 and 3 Ed. VI. c. 1.

and in this ſecond goſpel the communion was ordered to be delivered with the following words:—*The body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which was given for thee, preſerve thy body and ſoul into everlaſting life.* But it was ſoon diſcovered that this form favoured of the corruption of popery; within a few years, though it had been adopted by the aid of the Holy Ghoſt, it was expunged, and a new form ſubſtituted by the aid of the ſame divine ſpirit. The euchariſt was no longer the body of Chriſt; by the magic touch of an act of parliament, it was converted into a bare remembrance of his death: (y)—*Take and eat this in remembrance that Chriſt died for thee; and feed on him in thy heart by faith and thankſgiving.* At the ſame time the articles of religion were framed, and by them it was declared, that *it did not become any of the faithful to profeſs that there is a real or corporal preſence of the body and blood of Chriſt in the holy euchariſt.* This new form, with the declaration in the articles, gave offence to many whoſe minds could not keep pace with the principal reformers in the godly career of innovation; and in the third of Elizabeth it was determined to quiet their alarms, and to allure them to the eſtabliſhed church, by adopting a language more conformable to their feelings and belief. Hence in the delivery of the communion, both the forms of Edward VI. were ordered to be united, that the objections of the catholic might be removed, without offending the ſcruples of the orthodox believer; and in the article, the denial of the real preſence was obliterated, and in its ſtead an explication introduced, which, according to the prejudices or judgment of the reader, might, from the manner in which it was worded, denote either the

(y) 5 and 6 of Ed. VI. c. 1.

real exiſtence or the real non-exiſtence of Chriſt's body and blood in the Lord's ſupper. This, I believe, will prove to be the true hiſtory of the obſcurity which prevails in every official document on the nature of the ſacrament; the beſt interpretation of the unknown tongue, under which the eſtabliſhed church has choſen to veil her real ſentiments. (z)

2. On the invocation of ſaints, the clergyman aſks one queſtion, and hazards two obſervations. He aſks, whether in the ſuppoſition that their interceſſion be ſolicited, not with Chriſt, but with God the Father, or the bleſſed Trinity, the remarker be willing to allow that an injury is done to the one mediatorſhip of Chriſt? I will anſwer for the remarker in the negative, provided their interceſſion be ſuppoſed to reſt on the merits of Chriſt. Now if he will take the trouble to look at the five prayers which he has tranſcribed, he will find that they all end with the words "*Through Chriſt our Lord.*"

He aſſerts that when proteſtants pray for their fellow-creatures here upon earth, their prayers are imputed to their own account. "We may hope, indeed, but dare not affirm, that they may ſometimes be ſerviceable to them who are the ſubjects of them." If this doctrine be true, it muſt follow, that St Paul was no proteſtant; for he deſired the Romans to pray for him, not that their prayers might be imputed to them, but that *he* might be delivered from the unbelievers. (*a*) I even tremble for the orthodoxy of the venerable biſhop of London himſelf, who exhorts every ſincere chriſtian to perſevere in that moſt *benevolent* office of interceding for all mankind. (*b*) Were the learned prelate to

(z) See Gilbert, biſhop of Sarum, on the 39 articles, art. 28.
(*a*) Rom. xv. 30, 31. (*b*) Sermons, vol. ii. p. 381.

ſtudy theology at the feet of our Durham Gamaliel, he would learn that to intercede for others, inſtead of being a benevolent, was a ſelfiſh office; that it might indeed be imputed to us, but no one could affirm that it was beneficial to them. From what part of the ſacred text did the clergyman glean this article of his creed? (*c*)

He proceeds to inſinuate that, when catholics ſolicit the interceſſion of the bleſſed in heaven, it is "becauſe they dare not addreſs our Redeemer for mercy, dare not rely on his merits alone for the acceptance of their ſincere and humble ſupplications; of conſequence, that they diſtruſt and diſhonour his mediation, and, by ſuch uſages, deſerve the cenſure of every zealous chriſtian." I muſt again beg of him to look at the example of St Paul. When that apoſtle deſired the Romans to pray for his deliverance, was it "becauſe he durſt not addreſs his Redeemer, or rely on his mercy alone for the acceptance of his ſupplication?" Did he then "diſtruſt and diſhonour the mediation of Chriſt, and deſerve the cenſure of every zealous chriſtian?" Either St Paul was ignorant of the rudiments of chriſtian theology, or our new teacher has yet to learn them.

The next ſubject in the order of the biſhop's charge is that of penance. To learn on what terms the ſinner may expect to make his peace with an offended God, is certainly a matter of great importance, and, from its importance, muſt forcibly arreſt the attention of thoſe who undertake to frame a religious creed. In the primitive church the peni-

(*c*) Perhaps from Gen. xviii. 32, where God promiſes, upon Abraham's interceſſion, to ſpare Sodom for the ſake of ten men, if ten righteous men were found in it; perhaps from Exodus, xxxii. 30, where Moſes makes atonement for the ſin of the people; perhaps from Job xlii. 7, where the Lord receives the interceſſion of Job for his friends.

tent ſinner was condemned to a long courſe of faſting and auſterity, and this diſcipline was then conceived to be founded on the cleareſt evidence of the inſpired writings. When the reformation began to proſper, there was reaſon to fear that its authors, from their *known* partiality to primitive fervour and primitive doctrine, would have introduced the ancient ſyſtem; but fortunately for mankind, they compaſſionated the weakneſs of our nature, and inſtead of ſubjecting their diſciples to the penitential canons of paſt ages, very liberally emancipated them, even from the reſtraints which popery ſtill continued to impoſe upon ſinners. Now as the biſhop had condemned the catholic doctrine on the ſubject of penance, it was not raſh to infer that he concurred in opinion with the fathers of his faith; and the remarker had in conſequence commented on his right reverend adverſary with ſome degree of ſeverity. His comments have provoked the indignation of the clergyman, who feels, or affects to feel, for the inſult offered to his biſhop, and, with a Stentorian voice, accuſes the remarker of "a groſs and glaring perverſion of the opinion of the prelate." "It would be a mockery," he exclaims, "to pretend to think it unintentional; it would be a mere affectation of charity to regard your inſulting tone," &c. &c. (*d*)

——Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ!

If I know the remarker, he would not, I am ſure, pervert or miſrepreſent the opinion of any man, much leſs of ſo reſpectable a prelate as the biſhop of Durham. But is it certain that the biſhop's opinion has been perverted? By condemning the doc-

(*d*) Clergyman's Letter, p. 30.

trine of the church of Rome, as a denial of the efficacy of Chriſt's paſſion, does he not alſo deny the neceſſity of works of penance? Is it not his opinion, that nothing more is neceſſary for repentance than ſorrow for paſt ſin, and a ſincere deſire to amend in future? If I am miſtaken, I ſhall be happy to acknowledge my miſtake; but if I am not, does not his doctrine then whiſper theſe comfortable words into the ear of the ſinner? *You need not fear the rigours of penance. To weep and pray, to faſt and give alms, to repent in ſackcloth and aſhes, belonged only to the Jewiſh diſpenſation. All that is now required is to be ſorry, and amend; and this may be done when you can ſin no longer.* I do not mean to ſay that the right reverend prelate would preach in this manner; but I maintain that his doctrine, ſuppoſing it to be as I have conceived it, will naturally lead to ſuch conſequences.

But let us liſten to the declamation of the clergyman. In his zeal to convict the remarker, he has had the misfortune to condemn the biſhop; and while he accuſes his opponent of the crime of miſrepreſentation, he imputes the diſgrace of ignorance to his patron. The doctrine, he tells us, which the prelate meant to condemn, was that which teaches "the impoſition of penances to be abſolutely neceſſary to obtain pardon for ſin, and the performance of the penance enjoined (or indulgence for non-performance) to be requiſite for the reſtoration of the ſinner." If this be all, the remarker, I have no doubt, will ſubſcribe to his lordſhip's cenſure. It is a doctrine which we are as willing to anathematize as he is: it would not be ſuffered, without animadverſion, in any catholic writer. I am happy to find that for once we can agree.

The next point in ſucceſſion is communion under one kind. I am ſorry to lead the reader to ſuch

unintereſting ſubjects. The biſhop had, at leaſt, the merit of exhibiting his old matter under a new form, and, by marſhalling his arguments in three diviſions, was enabled to intruſt one to the patronage of each of the three perſons of the moſt bleſſed Trinity. This was novel and curious. But the clergyman "is a dull matter-of-fact enquirer." (*e*) He has been content to revive antiquated objections, and to dreſs them in the ſame garb they wore two centuries ago. I am compelled to reply in the ſame ſtyle; and if the reader be ſometimes fatigued with the dulneſs of the matter or the method, I hope that, inſtead of accuſing the inſipidity, he will compaſſionate the fate of the writer, condemned to the weariſome taſk of refuting ſophiſms, and unmaſking miſrepreſentations, which have been refuted and unmaſked a thouſand times before.

The clergyman's firſt obſervation is, that the argument from authority will weigh nothing againſt the expreſs injunction of our Lord. The remarker did not adduce it to prove that it is lawful to violate the injunction of our Lord, but to prove that no ſuch injunction was ever given. The clergyman maintains that there was, the remarker that there was not. Suppoſing them equal in judgment, the diſpute muſt either be decided by authority, or muſt remain for ever undecided. (*f*)

He continues to obſerve that the biſhop and the church of which he is a member, conſider the wine as part of the matter of the ſacrament: that there

(*e*) Clergyman's Letter, p. 8.

(*f*) The clergyman wiſhes for ſome proof that communion under one kind was always partially admitted. I ſhall at preſent refer him to Pope Leo, Serm. IV. de Quad. tom. i. p. 217; Euſebius, Hiſt. l. vi. c. 44, p. 200; the Eleventh Council of Toledo, Concil. tom. vi. can. 11; St Cyprian de Lapſis, p. 133; St Auguſtine, Epiſt. 98, olim 23; Paulinus, Vit. St Ambroſii, No. 47; Tertullian ad Uxor. lib. xi. c. 5, p. 169.

is no authority to affirm the ſacrament to be received at all, if all that conſtitutes the matter is not received: that there is no more reaſon for conſidering the reception of the cup as only a part of the manner, than for thinking the ſame of the bread alſo; and that if each may be omitted ſeparately, both may be omitted together." (*g*) This is a moſt curious ſpecimen of logical acumen. So then, if the Durham clergyman have a rich living in view, and know of two methods by either of which he may procure it, he will ſit down in his chair, and thus reaſon coolly with himſelf. I may procure the living by either of theſe two methods; therefore each may be omitted ſeparately: but "if each may be omitted ſeparately, both may be omitted together:" therefore I will omit both, and I ſhall infallibly procure the living!—But it is certain that the church of which he is a member, teaches the wine to be part of the matter of the ſacrament; and that if it be not received, there is no authority to affirm that the ſacrament is received at all! I have ſome reaſon to doubt it. 1. It is very probable that a great, if not the greater, part of wine uſed in the church, is of Engliſh manufacture, that is to ſay, no wine at all. If then without the wine there be no ſacrament, it will not be raſh to aſſert that the communion is frequently adminiſtered to very little purpoſe. 2. I have a very great authority to produce againſt the biſhop, even the authority of his own church. In the firſt of Edward VI. c. 1, it was enacted, "that the moſt bleſſed ſacrament be hereafter *commonly* delivered and miniſtered unto the people under both kinds, that is to ſay, of bread and wine, except neceſſity otherwiſe require:" and

(*g*) Clergyman's Letter, p. 31.

the king, immediately after, in his quality of head of the church, iſſued a proclamation to the ſame effect, in the very ſame words. This ſtatute was, indeed, repealed by Mary, but was re-enacted by 1. Elizabeth, c. 1. Now, unleſs we ſay that Edward in the plenitude of his eccleſiaſtical power, with the concurrence of his parliament, diſpenſed from the injunction of Chriſt, it will follow that the Engliſh church did not originally conceive the wine to be an eſſential part of the ſacrament. For thoſe who ſay that one kind ſhould not be adminiſtered *commonly*, grant that it may be done ſometimes: and by ſpecifying the caſe of neceſſity, acknowledge the propriety of the doctrine that teaches only one kind to be eſſential to the ſacrament. But if he object to the authority of his own church, he certainly will yield to that of its great forefather, the adventurous Luther. According to that infallible divine, "They ſin not againſt Chriſt, who uſe one kind only, ſeeing Chriſt has not commanded to uſe both. Though it were an excellent thing to uſe both kinds in the ſacrament, and Chriſt has commanded nothing in this as neceſſary, yet it were better to follow peace and unity, than to conteſt about kinds." So much for authority. (*b*)

The clergyman again endeavours to prove that Chriſt actually commanded all chriſtians to receive under the form of wine. The only ſemblance of ſuch a command is to be found in the words—*Drink ye all of it*. Now let us conſider the circumſtances

(*b*) Lib. de Capt. Babyl. c. de Euch. Epist. ad Bohemos, in declar. Euch. et in Serm. de Euch. I quote from an English translation, as the original Latin is not in my possession. I know he also wrote against communion in one kind; but that reformer built his faith on scripture, and he could make scripture speak pro and con, just as it suited his purpose.

in which theſe words were ſpoken. Our bleſſed Redeemer was ſeated at ſupper with his twelve apoſtles: he took the bread and brake it, and divided it among them: he then took the cup, but as he could not divide it in like manner, he gave it among them, ſaying,—"Drink ye all of it." And, obſerves an Evangeliſt, "they all drank of it." Now theſe words, we are told, were addreſſed not only to the apoſtles, but alſo to every chriſtian. Yet is there the leaſt proof of the aſſertion? I have never met with any. And ſtill, becauſe we are unwilling to ſubmit our own judgment to that of men, who have no reaſon to ſuppoſe themſelves ſuperior in that faculty to ourſelves, and who acknowledge themſelves to be the fallible diſciples of a fallible church, we are to be abuſed as corrupters of religion, derogators from the command of Chriſt, and mutilators of the ſacrament!—As to the diſtinction between the matter and the manner: we acknowledge the wine to be part of the matter of the ſacrifice, but we deny it to be neceſſarily part of the matter of the ſacrament. (*i*) I could wiſh to know, what makes the

(*i*) In answer to the remarker's obſervation on 1 Cor. xi. 27. the clergyman maintains that the true meaning is evident from the preceding verſe, in which is mentioned communion in both kinds. I am not convinced that this will ſerve his purpoſe. The twenty-ſixth verſe is addreſſed in the plural number to the whole body of the Corinthian converts; and from it may be juſtly inferred, that the uſual method of adminiſtering the communion in that city was under both kinds. But, in the next verſe, the apoſtle changes his language, and addreſſes them individually, and tells them that whoſoever ate *or* drank unworthily, was guilty of the body and blood of the Lord: From which it may with equal juſtice be inferred that, though the principal part of the congregation received under both kinds, ſome received under one only. The clergyman is unwilling to relinquiſh the *and* in the Engliſh verſion. He ſays, that though the edition in which the remarker may read the Greek teſtament has the diſjunctive *or*, yet ſeveral of the oldeſt MSS. and verſions have the copulative *and*. I could wiſh to learn in what edition he has ever read the Greek teſtament with the copulative *and*. I ſuſpect in none: and notwithſtanding the authority of his

clergyman so positive, that wine is part of the matter? The scripture, indeed, mentions the cup, but it no where mentions that the liquor which it contained was wine; and, if I mistake not, according to protestant principles, nothing is to be believed as of faith, but what is expressly asserted in the holy scriptures.

3. The subject of ritual observances shall soon be dismissed. The clergyman observes that, "if they do not promote the cause of true piety, they must injure it." To this position I most cordially assent: And from it draw an inference equally favourable to the remarker, and unfavourable to the bishop and his advocate. If the necessary effect do not follow, we may infer that the cause does not exist: If true piety be not injured among catholics, it will follow that their ritual observances, so far from proving injurious, are even serviceable to the cause of virtue. Now this may be decided by an easy experiment. Let the Durham clergyman compare the morals and piety of the next catholic congregation with those of his own parishioners, and then let him say whether the former are inferior in that respect to any of their neighbours. If he cannot, let him cease to affirm that the rites of the catholic church are injurious to piety, or derogatory from the sanctifying influence of the holy spirit.

MSS and versions, I have never yet met with any editor, who has had the boldness to foist it into the text. In the old version of the English established church (so I am assured, for I have not the means of consulting it) originally the disjunctive *or* was retained. But it was then the doctrine of the same church that communion under one kind was lawful in some cases. Now that opinion is condemned, and therefore in the new translation of James I. which is still in use, the disjunctive *or* has been magically converted into the copulative *and*. Thus it appears that the good people of England, while they are persuaded that they build their belief on the words of scripture, are in reality building it on the whims, or prejudices, or judgements of translators and editors, as fallible as themselves.

We cheriſh with reſpect ſuch rites and ceremonies, as really belong to our religion. (*k*) They are as monuments which atteſt its antiquity and authenticity: they have deſcended to us from our fathers, and prove that our faith is not of modern birth.—Let the Durham clergyman read the oldeſt liturgies ſtill extant, aud he will find many of them there: Let him read the pentateuch of Moſes and the goſpel, and he will find many of them there. He will learn that ſome are of divine origin, and others almoſt as ancient as chriſtianity. It was, however, well done of the reformers to aboliſh them. What has a modern religion to do with ancient ceremonies? Or what has the belief of the metaphorical preſence of Chriſt's body to do with rites eſtabliſhed in honour of its real preſence? He is angry that prayers of benediction ſhould be read over the veſtments uſed in the celebration of the maſs. Let him peruſe the benediction of the ſacerdotal veſtments recorded by Moſes, or St Paul's epiſtle to Timothy, and he will then learn, that God himſelf appointed ſuch ceremonies, and that "every creature is ſanctified by the word of God and by prayer."

When the magnanimous fathers of the reformation ſeparated from the church of Rome, one object

(*k*) The clergyman objects to pilgrimages, and rosaries or beads. As to the first, they may be of advantage or disadvantage according to circumstances. They form no part of the catholic doctrine: They may be made or not, as may be judged proper. See an account of ancient pilgrimages in the Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon church, vol. ii. page 122. Rosaries are also a matter of discretionary devotion. They were first adopted for the use of the vulgar, who could not read. Whether they consist of Pater Nosters, or of Ave Marias, is of little consequence. Some use one, and some the other. The Ave Maria consists of two passages of scripture commemorative of the incarnation of Christ, and of a petition that his holy mother would pray for us. The Durham clergyman may, if he please, become an orthodox catholic, and never repeat it to his death.

which engaged much of their attention, was to juſtify or palliate their ſchiſm. For this purpoſe every ſpecies of expedient was adopted; and among the catholic doctrines, which they misrepreſented and vilified, was that which teaches the utility and neceſſity of good works. The piety of Luther urged him to retire as far as poſſible from the corruptions of Babylon. With one daſh of his pen, he magnanimouſly aboliſhed the obligation of good works, and opened the gates of heaven to every man who could only boaſt the gift of an all-ſaving faith. (*l*) This ſolifidian tenet, it muſt be acknowledged, with the church of England in her articles, "is a moſt wholeſome doctrine, and very full of comfort." (*m*) The reſtraints of religion are too unpleasant to the paſſions of men.

'Tis prudence to reform her into ease,
And put her in undress to make her please.
A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,
And leave the luggage of good works behind.

On this head we have undoubtedly great obligations to Luther. Our bleſſed Redeemer died for us, and ſtill left the way to happineſs ſtrait and rugged: the new apoſtle ruſhed to the arms of his faithful Catharine, and made it ſpacious and commodious. After Chriſt, it was ſtill ſo uninviting, that, as he declared, few would chuſe to walk in it: after Luther, it was cleared of the thorns of virtue, and might with eaſe be trodden by thouſands. His diſciples, however, have gradually learnt to bluſh at the extravagance of their maſter: in the courſe of time they have ſilently abandoned his ſchool, and

(*l*) Sola fides est necessaria ut justi simus, cætera omnia liberrima. In cap. 2 ad Gal. Nullum peccatum inferre potest damnationem, sed sola incredulitas. De capt. Babyl. tom, ii. fol. 171. De lib. Christ. tom, v. fol. 311.

(*m*) Art. xi.

have returned, on this point at leaſt, nearer to the doctrine of ſcripture and common ſenſe. But the unnatural portrait which their great patriarch had drawn of the catholic doctrine, they ſtill cheriſh with filial reſpect, and conſider as an invaluable legacy. It appears to be at preſent in the joint poſſeſſion of the biſhop of Durham, and the clergyman of the dioceſe of Durham: poor Elijah, if I may judge from his pamphlet, has no ſhare in the property. The right reverend prelate, in his charge, was content to advert to what he called the preſumptuous doctrine of the church of Rome concerning the merit of good works; and the author of the Remarks demonſtrated in reply, that this preſumption exiſted no where but in the heated imagination of his lordſhip. The clergyman will not permit ſuch an anſwer to eſcape uncenſured. In the moſt forcible language, he contends that his caricature is a faithful likeneſs, and that the pencil of the remarker has treacherouſly concealed every harſh and forbidding feature. "You tell us ſomething," he exclaims, "but you do not tell us all. Does not your church alſo require you to believe that good works actually *merit* their reward, and that they may do more than merit it? that, unprofitable ſervants as you are, ſome among you may yet beſtow of their ſuperabundant goodneſs to improve the condition and alleviate the puniſhment of their leſs righteous brethren?" Such interrogations appear to him equal to a victory; and he concludes, at ſome diſtance, with adviſing the remarker "never more to yield to the tempting hope of ſtrengthening his cauſe by ſtratagems, which have been hitherto proſcribed by the laws of literary warfare." As to his advice, his opponent, probably, would ſend him to thoſe lines of the poet:—

Dii te, Damasippe, deæque
Verum ob consilium donent tonsore.

In answer to his questions I shall reply, that our church does *not* require us to believe either that our good works *merit* their reward, in the sense which he attaches to the word merit, or that they may do more than merit it, so that some among us may bestow of their superabundant goodness to their less righteous brethren. In effect, the whole controversy between us at present on this head is, I believe, a mere logomachia, "a windy war of words." If a person promise me a reward on certain conditions with which I comply, I may, I trust, without offering considerable violence to propriety of language, say that I have merited or earned my reward; even though the reward were in its own nature to exceed the exact value of my services. However, should the propriety of the word, merit, be disputed, I would not contend; the acquisition of the reward would be my object, and if I obtained that, I should be content, whether I were allowed to say I merited it, or not.

From good works we naturally proceed to indulgences; a subject which has often been discussed by protestant writers, but with more passion than sincerity. If frequency of repetition could give to misrepresentation the substance of truth, an indulgence would be of all scandalous things the most scandalous. The bishop of Durham seems to have adopted this principle: he conceived he might justly assume the privilege of saying what had been said by hundreds before him; and therefore, without hesitation, condemned the practice of indulgences in terms the most pointed and severe. But the remarker was not to be intimidated by an episcopal frown: He tore the visor from the face of the supposed

monſter; and lo, its deformity vaniſhed, nor could the critical eye of the Durham clergyman diſcover in it one forbidding feature. But how was this gentleman's aſtoniſhment increaſed, when he learned that indulgences had alſo been favourites with the clergy of the eſtabliſhed church; that his reverend brethren had frequently condeſcended to be the venders of wares, which he had thought the excluſive property of a lady, ſometimes politely termed the w— of Babylon? He had recourſe to his uſual theme, the inſincerity, artifice, and legerdemain of the remarker. He accuſed him of having varniſhed over with a deceitful gloſs the doctrine of his church; of confeſſing, indeed, that indulgences are remiſſions of eccleſiaſtical cenſure, or mitigations of puniſhment in this world, but of concealing that they are alſo "remiſſions of every ſin, and promiſes of eternal life." Having thus ſhewn, as he conceives, the difference between proteſtant and catholic indulgences, he recovers his uſual temper, and very charitably affects to fear for the orthodoxy of his dear friend the remarker, to tremble leſt his doctrine ſhould involve him in the ſame fate with Luther, the parent of the reformation. I will endeavour to quiet his alarm. The remarker is in no danger of meeting with the fate of Luther in this world; and if he will follow my advice, will not be very ambitious of ſharing it with him in the other. For the information of the clergyman I will add, that the catholic doctrine does not teach, that indulgences are "a remiſſion of all ſins," or even of any ſins, (*n*) or that they are "applications of the ſuper-

(*n*) When these expressions *peccatorum indulgentia* or *remissio* occur in grants of indulgences, they are perfectly understood by catholics, though not in the sense of the Durham clergyman. As an indispensable condition it is required that the sinner shall have

fluous merits of Christ and the saints." The first of these assertions is contradictory to the catholic creed; the second is an opinion which has been maintained by speculative and ingenious men; but it forms no part of the catholic faith, and may, without danger of censure, be believed or disbelieved according to the judgment of each individual.

Before I conclude this subject, I may be allowed to ask, how the clergyman will prove that the doctrine of the catholic is more indulgent to the sinner than the doctrine of the protestant church. According to the latter, as far as I can learn, all that is required for the remission of sin, is a hearty sorrow for the offence, and a fixed determination to amend. Now all this the popes require in their bulls, and besides this, confession and the performance of some good work. Our indulgences considered in this light, cannot be more subversive of morality than the practices of the established church. If the purity of our doctrine has sometimes been polluted by the vices of those who maintained it, it ought not to be matter of surprise. Avarice could infect one of the apostles of Jesus: can we wonder if, at different periods, it infected some of their successors. It could even creep into the church of England, a society small in comparison, and but recently established to put down the errors and corruptions of

previously performed whatever the catholic church considers necessary for the remission of sin; and then only she grants him a remission of the canonical penance, or temporal punishment, to which he ought to be subjected. Hence it is evident that an indulgence cannot be a pardon for sin, since the sin is supposed to have been already pardoned. As to the ingenious comment on attrition in page 37, it is founded on a mistake. No catholic divine ever taught that the sinner could be reconciled to God without a firm resolution of amendment; neither did the council assert that attrition *sufficed*, but that it *disposed* the sinner to obtain the remission of his offences. Sess. 14, c. 4.

popery: can we wonder, if it has ſometimes found its way into a body infinitely more numerous, and which has ſubſiſted through a long ſucceſſion of ages? Catholics have lamented theſe abuſes as much as proteſtants can do: and if any opponent will conſult the acts of the councils during the two centuries preceding the reformation, he will find in them canons as ſevere and appoſite, as any which for a ſimilar purpoſe have been enacted by the preſent church of England. Should it then be aſked, why theſe abuſes were not aboliſhed before the council of Trent, the clergyman cannot be at a loſs for an anſwer. He muſt be well aware of the common defect of all religious eſtabliſhments. "When abuſes have once crept into them, which will ever attend every government and every inſtitution adminiſtered by men, the want of that quick diſcernment of faults, which is oftener found in enemies than in friends, prevents many diſorders from being rectified, many abuſes from being reformed, and many ſpirited, yet ſalutary, meaſures from being carried into execution." (*o*) This truth has been

(*o*) See an elegant and inſtructive tract, *An enquiry into the moral and political tendency of the religion called Roman Catholic*, printed for Robinsons, and Faulder, 1790, p. 27.—As the remarker is indebted to the Durham clergyman for an indulgence published by Gregory VIII. I hope he will accept in return one or two protestant indulgences. The first was published by the pious Luther, and contains a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances. That it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I shall transcribe it in the original language. "Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim. Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut femina non sis, sic nec in te est, ut absque viro degas . . . . . Tertia ratio divortii est, ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit —Hic opportunum est, ut maritus dicat: *Si tu nolueris, altera volet: Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla.*" Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt. tom. v. fol. 119, 123. The second was an indulgence granted by Luther and seven other divines to Philip, Landgrave of Heſſe, to have two wives at the ſame time. For the edification of the public I ſhall extract a few

fully exemplified in the reformed church of England.

On the celebration of the liturgy in an unknown tongue, the clergyman is content with referring his adverſary to 1 Cor. xiv. which he conſiders as a poſitive condemnation of the catholic practice. I have read the whole chapter with great attention, and the conſequence is a conviction in my mind, that our intellects have been caſt in two very different moulds. Of that which he ſees ſo clearly, I have been unable to diſcover the fainteſt trace. I do not obſerve that the apoſtle ever mentions the liturgy, or ſo much as refers to it: all his animadverſions ſeem to be directed againſt the vanity or inſubordination of the converts, who were eager to diſplay,

passages, and translate them into English. The bull itself may be seen in the original Latin, in Bossuet's Variations, l. vi. In his declaration to Luther and Melancthon, the Landgrave had informed them, that he had never loved his wife, that he had not been faithful to her more than three weeks, and that he could not abandon the dissolute state of life in which he lived. For these reasons he begs a dispensation to have two wives. In their answer, after some preliminary observations, they proceed thus. "But if your highness do not abstain from an impure life, because you say it is impossible for you to do so, we should wish that your highness were in a better state before God. . . . But if your highness be fully resolved to take another wife, we judge that it ought to be done secretly, as we have said above with respect to the dispensation; that is to say, that none but the lady herself, and a few trusty persons obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession, know any thing of the matter. Hence it will not be attended with any important contradiction or scandal. For it is not unusual for princes to keep mistresses; and though the vulgar should be scandalized, the more prudent would understand this moderate method of life, and would prefer it to adultery, or other brutal and foul actions.—There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all go right with conscience. . . . . Your highness hath therefore not only the approbation of us all, in a case of necessity, but also the considerations which we have made thereupon. . . . . We are most ready to serve your highness. Dated at Wittemberg, the Wednesday after the feast of St Nicholas, 1539.

MARTIN LUTHER, ADAM,
PHILIP MELANCTHON, JOHN LENINGUE,
MARTIN BUCER, JUSTUS WINTFERTE,
ANTHONY CORVIN, DIONYSIUS MELANTHER.

in the assembly of the faithful, the graces which they had received, and, by their extemporary discourses, frequently disturbed the harmony of the service. Still the apostle indulges them in the use of unknown tongues, but under certain limitations, to prevent disedification and scandal; and I hope that those who so forcibly urge against catholics the obligation of complying with the command of St Paul, will not refuse to give us the example by following it themselves. We will suppose, for a moment, that my reverend adversary has assented to this proposition; then the service in his church will be arranged in the following very edifying manner.

As soon as the clergyman shall have read the liturgy according to the book of common prayer, one of his parishioners (whether clerk or layman is no matter) will rise, and, in a most impressive manner, harangue the audience in some foreign language, perhaps in High Dutch. The moment he is silent, a second preacher will succeed in Arabic; and he will be followed by a third in Chinese. After the orators, the apostle commands the interpreter to explain; and the clergyman must take this difficult office on himself, unless he chance to be assisted by the learned Messieurs Faber and Grenville Sharpe, the enlightened expositors of the book of Revelations. Prophesying will close the service; and every man who can persuade himself that he feels the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, will claim a right to groan out the yearnings of his spirit into the ears of his brethren. In this place, however, I am sorry to inform the ladies, that, though the female tongue appears to be far better adapted to the office of prophesying than that of the other sex, yet the apostle is positive in his prohibition. They must be content to sit in silence, and listen with deference to

the lectures of the male prophets. (p) This is a picture of the ſyſtem of divine ſervice, which the imprudence of the converts compelled the apoſtle to ſanction with his approbation. But it is evident that both his approbation and cenſure were confined to a temporary object; and that, at the ceſſation of miraculous gifts, they became a dead letter, the mere teſtimony of diſorders which once had exiſted, and were never likely to be revived.

Sometimes, when I have amuſed myſelf with looking into the book of common prayer, I have found it difficult to perſuade myſelf that I was not reading an unknown tongue. I will inſtance a paſſage or two for the inſtruction and edification of my readers. "Let them not ſee the ſun. Or ever your pots be made hot with thorns; ſo let indignation vex him even as a thing that is raw. (q) Judah is my lawgiver. Moab is my waſh-pot. Over Edom will I caſt my ſhoe. Philiſtia, be thou glad of me. (r) Though ye have lien among the pots, yet ſhall ye be as the wings of a dove; that is, covered with ſilver wings, and her feathers like gold. And the hill of Baſan, ſo is God's hill; even an high hill, as the hill of Baſan. Why hop ye ſo high, ye high hills." (s) Nor is this unknown tongue confined to the book of common prayer: it is extended even to the book of homilies, that model of paſtoral eloquence, which the church of England propoſes to her clergy. What female of the

(p) If any ſpeak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two or at moſt by three, and that by courſe; and let one interpret. Let the prophets ſpeak two or three, and let the others judge. If any thing be revealed to another that ſitteth by, let the firſt hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one. Let your women keep ſilence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to ſpeak. 1 Cor. xiv. 27. 29. 30. 31. 34.

(q) 11th day, morning prayer. (r) Same day, evening prayer.

(s) 13th day, morning prayer.

preſent day could underſtand the following elegant apoſtrophe?—"O thou woman, not a chriſtian, but worſe than a panim, thou miniſter of the devil, why pampereſt thou that carrion fleſh ſo high, which ſometime doth ſtink on the earth as thou goeſt? Howſoever thou perfumeſt thyſelf, thy beaſtlineſs cannot be hidden, or overcome with thy ſmells and ſavours: but, perchance, ſome dainty dame will ſay, and anſwer me," &c.

On the Vulgate tranſlation of the ſcriptures the clergyman has been ſparing of his comments: I ſhall beg leave to be more diffuſe. It is a ſubject, reſpecting which much miſrepreſentation was formerly circulated, and which has been treated with no ſmall degree of prejudice by ſome modern controverſialiſts. (*t*)

(*t*) Here I may be allowed to obſerve, that the blaſt of the eccleſiaſtical trumpet has lately awakened from his ſlumbers a watchman of the holy city, the Rev. George Stephenſon, M. A. vicar of Kelloe, curate of Biſhopwearmouth, and formerly fellow of Magdalen college. In conſequence of the biſhop's charge, this indefatigable divine has compoſed, preached, and publiſhed twenty ſermons, for the charitable purpoſe of expoſing the abominations of the church of Rome. His work does at leaſt honour to the moral character of the inhabitants of Biſhopwearmouth. It proves that, in the opinion of their paſtor, during twenty weeks there was no need of propoſing to their conſideration any ſubject of piety or morality. At the ſame time, I fear, it is ſome reflection on their intellectual attainments. I do not conceive that the curate of Biſhopwearmouth, had he believed his pariſhioners to be poſſeſſed of common ſenſe, could have thought it neceſſary to warn them againſt ſeduction to a religion ſo abſurd as that which he has delineated in his pages. I may alſo ſay, that I admire the taſte of the man, who could delight in raking together ſo much filth out of the common ſewers: his book is ſcarcely made up of any thing elſe. But my principal reaſon for calling the attention of the reader to this publication, was, to notice the manner in which he has treated the ſubject on which I am now engaged; and, unfortunately, he has treated all the reſt in nearly the ſame manner.

Accipe nunc Danaum inſidias, et crimine ab uno
Diſce omnes.

He tells us, p. 325, that the church of Rome has declared, that the holy ſcriptures were not compoſed for the uſe of the multitude,

1. Of all the ancient verſions of the ſacred writings, the Vulgate has obtained the higheſt degree of praiſe from the ableſt biblical ſtudents, both proteſtants and catholics; and it poſſeſſes, in another reſpect, an invaluable advantage over all modern tranſlations. It was adopted in the Latin church long before the birth of thoſe controverſies, which at preſent divide the children of the reformation from the communion of Rome. Its author or authors, therefore, cannot be accuſed of any bias or partiality, which might induce them to pervert the meaning of the paſſages connected with the ſubjects in debate.

2. Soon after the reformation, Europe was inundated with a flood of biblical tranſlations, ſome of which were diſgraced by the moſt corrupt doctrines,

but only of their ſpiritual teachers; and, under this pretext, has ordered them to be taken from the people," &c. I answer that the church of Rome never did issue such a declaration. If I am wrong, let him produce it. "In Spain the Bible," he says, "is locked up from the laity: the use of it, in their own tongue, is forbidden, under the severest penalties." Yet in Spain it is permitted in their own tongue, and the Spaniards boast, that their translation is the most elegant of all those that have hitherto been made in any of the vulgar languages.—He says, p. 329, that the English Romanists have a version, but are not permitted to read it without a license. Let him ask the first catholic he meets in Bishopwearmouth, and from him he may learn the contrary.—The French Romanists, he continues, have no authorised translation in their language. I answer, that they have several, some of great antiquity, others of more modern date. They have a version by Des Moulins made in 1294, and one by De Presle in 1380, a third by Le Fevre printed in 1528, a fourth by the Louvain doctors in 1550, a fifth by Corbin in 1643, and a sixth by Sacy in 1672. There are also authorised translations in Germany and Italy, and, I have no doubt, in all other catholic countries.—Hence we may form some judgment of Mr Stephenson's attention to veracity, and wonder how any man could utter such falsehoods from the pulpit, and in the name of the God of truth,—or how he could conceive, that, by such misrepresentation, he was fulfilling his duty of announcing glory to God on high, and *peace* to men on earth.—If the reader will take the trouble to compare Mr Des Mahis' work with its pretended refutation by Mr Stephenson, he will easily learn which of the two defends the better cause.

and glaring perverſions of the meaning of the original. In theſe circumſtances it became neceſſary for the catholic church to fix on ſome particular verſion, and propoſe it for the inſtruction of her children. The judgment of the fathers of the council of Trent ſelected the Vulgate; and it was decreed that in all public lectures, diſputes, ſermons, and interpretations, that verſion alone ſhould be conſidered as *authentic*. The meaning of this word has been perverted by the ingenuity of our adverſaries. By the council it was underſtood to denote, that, in all points of importance, the vulgate contained the true word of God, ſo that it might be ſafely peruſed without any danger of error in faith and morals: and here I may obſerve, that by this decree the catholic church did no more than Luther and Calvin did by their reſpective tranſlations, and the church of England does, at the preſent day, by her traſlation of the ſcriptures.

3. By declaring that, among the *verſions* of that period, the vulgate alone ſhould be conſidered as authentic, the council did not mean to confer on it a ſuperiority over the *originals*. Yet this is a calumny, which has given birth to much petulant invective againſt the ſpiritual tyranny of the catholic church, and much inſulting commiſeration for the ſpiritual blindneſs of her diſciples. Would thoſe who uſe ſuch language, ſpend a year in ſome catholic univerſity, they would learn with what application the originals are ſtudied, with what freedom they are cited, and how often their authority is alleged againſt certain paſſages of the vulgate in the public diſputations. Before the decree of the council, the catholics had publiſhed, and after it continued to publiſh corrected and improved editions of the Greek and Hebrew ſcriptures.

4. Much leſs was it the intention of the council to decree, that the vulgate was free from faults. It has frequently been emended by the orders of the Roman pontiffs, and many catholic writers have exerciſed their abilities in diſcovering and publiſhing the nature of theſe errors. Is there nothing to correct in the authoriſed verſion of the preſent church of England?

5. Neither is it true that catholics lock up the ſcriptures from the knowledge of the laity. Let our adverſaries, if they can, produce for this aſſertion the decree of any council, the bull of any pope, the ſtatute of any provincial ſynod, or the order of any biſhop. They know that they cannot. Their only reſource is the prohibition in the index. I muſt, however, obſerve, that the index has not the power of declaring articles of catholic faith, or of forming canons of general diſcipline. Its authority was always very confined, and in many catholic countries was never acknowledged. Yet this very prohibition contained in the index is only conditional, and has always been conſidered as a temporary regulation. At a time, when every ſpecies of impiety was taught by fanaticiſm, and ſupported by texts from the vernacular verſions of the ſcripture, Pius IV. thought it adviſeable, that in every pariſh the propriety or non-propriety of reading the ſacred writings in the vulgar tongue ſhould be left to the diſcretion and judgment of the curate. Had this regulation been adopted in the proteſtant churches, it would have ſpared the chriſtian religion many an extravagance, at which ſhe was compelled to bluſh. We ſhould not then have heard of the famous John of Leyden, who, by interpreting the bible, made himſelf king of Munſter, and introduced polygamy among his diſciples; nor of David of Delft, who, beſides the virtue

laſt mentioned, taught another equally creditable, that of inceſt; nor of Hermannus, the cobler of Optzant, who profeſſed to be the ſon of God, drank in the ſpirit from a hogſhead of ſtrong beer, and then exclaimed, "Kill, cut the throats of all the monks and popes. Repent, repent; for your deliverance is at hand." We ſhould not then have heard of William Simpſon, "who was moved of the Lord to go naked in markets, courts, &c." nor of Nailor, who, freed from the incumbrances of dreſs, entered Briſtol on horſeback, while the inſpired multitude ſhouted *Hoſanna to the ſon of David;* nor of the London leather-ſeller, with the edifying name of *Praiſe-God Barebone*, and his ſtill more ſaintly brother with the more impreſſive name of, *If Chriſt had not died for thee, thou hadſt been damned, Barebone.* During this period of religious inſanity, while the human mind was prepared for the reception of every extravagance, it was, perhaps, wiſely done to prohibit the lecture of the ſcripture to thoſe whom their paſtors did not think incapable of ſuch folly. What has the reformation obtained by the oppoſite conduct? It has divided Chriſtendom into a thouſand different ſects, diſſeminated an indifference to all religious truth, and kept the poor in a ſtate of the moſt diſtreſſing ignorance: and ſtill, with theſe facts ſtaring them in the face, men can come forward, and reproach the catholic church with obſtructing the diffuſion of ſcripture-knowledge; that church which, ſince the reformation, has been conſtantly employed in carrying the light of the goſpel to infidel nations; which, before that period, ſubdued the ferocity of the barbarous tribes that diſmembered the Roman empire; which led our pagan anceſtors from the altars of Woden to thoſe of the living God; and to which every people that has

learned to bow the knee to the divinity of Jeſus, is indebted for the knowledge of that ſacred name.

Thus have I patiently travelled through the pages of a pamphlet, which its own author has ingenuouſly pronounced to be dull and heavy. The tediouſneſs of the road was not relieved by one object capable of awakening curioſity, or of arreſting attention. I am glad we have done. The clergyman concludes his letter with an advice, to which the remarker probably would anſwer in the words of an old proverb: *Phyſician, cure thyſelf.* At parting I may be allowed to add one obſervation: That at a time when every arm ſhould be united to repel the common enemy, it is folly to diſturb unanimity by diſſeminating religious diſcord. Of thoſe who have thought proper to adopt ſuch conduct, I may applaud the intentions, but I muſt condemn the bigotry. They may be friends to the church in their hearts: their pens are its moſt dangerous enemies.

REPLY

TO

THE REV. THOS. LE MESURIER,

RECTOR OF NEWNTON LONGVILLE.

Alter rixatur de lanâ sæpe caprinâ,
Propugnat nugis armatus: scilicet; ut non
Sit mihi prima fides, et vere quod placet, ut non
Acriter elatrem, pretium ætas altera sordet.

WITH the preceding pages I had flattered myself that the controversy was closed: a recent publication has convinced me of my mistake. (*a*) From the county of Bucks, from his watch-tower of Newnton Longville, the Rev. Thomas Le Mesurier has sounded the alarm. His orthodoxy has been taught to tremble for the safety of the established church; and an imperious duty has compelled him to warn his brethren against the delusive sophistry of a work, "which, from its lively and entertaining stile, he fears is likely to become popular." (*b*)—What pleasing tales the vanity of an author may have whispered in the ear of the rector of Newnton Longville, is not for me to divine. His, undoubtedly, is a name well-known among the amateurs of the art of wrangling. He has measured weapons with the Edinburgh reviewers, and the Monthly

(*a*) See a pamphlet with the multifarious title of "A reply to certain observations of the Right Reverend Dr Milner, including some notice of the transactions of 1791, and 1793; of Dr Troy's pastoral charge; of the Pope's rescript; of the remarks upon the Bishop of Durham's charge; of the acts of the council of Constance; Mr Sydney Smith's sermon, and other matters." Farrago libelli!

(*b*) Ibid. p. 208.

reviewers; with Dr Lawrence, Dr Milner, and Dr Troy: and his numerous ſcars, the evidences of many a well-fought battle, bear an honourable teſtimony, if not to his ſucceſs, at leaſt to his courage. If then he be diſſatisfied with the ſervices of thoſe, who have already undertaken the defence of the biſhop's charge; (*c*) if he think himſelf better qualified to meet the remarker in the field of controverſy, he has certainly a right to make the experiment. It will be for the church, in whoſe cauſe he profeſſes to fight, to appreciate his merits, to reward his ſucceſs, or to lament his temerity.

Mr Le Meſurier appears to have ſtudied controverſial tactics in the claſſic pages of Homer. Like the heroes of that poet, he does not ruſh inconſiderately to the conflict, but arreſts his impetuoſity to inquire into the parentage and character of his opponent. It will be uncourteous in me to refuſe ſo ſmall a ſatisfaction. Be it then known to him that the remarker is no "falſe brother of the eſtabliſhed church," even though he may diſplay "a familiarity with Greek epigrams and Greek proverbs." Neither is he joined in communion with "the ſocinian Aikin;" though it be his opinion, that of all the ſects which have ſprung from that prolific parent the reformation, the ſocinians have the faireſt claim to the name of proteſtants. (*d*) Nor of the

(*c*) See two publications entitled, a Protestant's reply, and a Letter to the author of the Remarks, by a clergyman of the diocese of Durham.

(*d*) If Mr Le Mesurier will honour the last page of the Remarks with a second perusal, he will learn that its author had directed his attack, not against the doctrine of the Trinity as taught by the established church, but against the doctrine of the Bishop respecting the practices of the catholics.—In p. 173, he also accuses the remarker of ridiculing the doctrine of the Trinity, because Gregory XIII. had excommunicated the *Trinitarii*.—But to be a polemic it is not necessary to be acquainted with ecclesiastical history: otherwise Mr Le Mesurier must have known that the persons, who in that age were called Trinitarii, were those who rejected, not those who admitted, the doctrine of the Trinity.

Edinburgh and Monthly reviewers does he know much more, than that they have often taught him to laugh at the expenſe of the Rector of Newnton Longville. The remarker is a catholic, not one, "whoſe religious ſentiments ſit very looſe upon him," but a catholic from conviction, who, though he has never taken the oath or creed of Pius IV. believes all the religious tenets of his church with as much ſincerity, to ſay the leaſt, as Mr Le Meſurier does the thirty-nine articles to which he has ſubſcribed; and who eſteems it his pride and happineſs to belong, not to any modern ſect, but to that great ſociety of Chriſtians, which derives its deſcent in a direct and uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the apoſtles. With this explanation, I truſt he will be ſatisfied.

The ſubject which Mr Le Meſurier has ſelected for the firſt trial of his ſtrength with the author of the remarks, is an accuſation which the biſhop has frequently brought againſt the church of Rome; that by its corruptions it had been the parent of French infidelity, and of courſe was chargeable with all the horrors of the French revolution. To this indictment the remarker, in the name of his church, pleaded not guilty. From the ſpeculations of the biſhop he appealed to the evidence of hiſtory. He moved for a writ to enquire, who was the true parent of the child. He contended that, in reality, modern atheiſm was the offspring, not of popery, but of proteſtantiſm: that the French were only the ſcholars of the Engliſh infidels: and that theſe were indebted for their ſuperior illumination to the intrepidity with which they had puſhed, to their full extent, the fundamental principles of the reformation. (e) To a genealogy ſo well corroborated by dates

(e) In the very outset Mr Le Mesurier gives a very favourable specimen of his abilities as an advocate. The bishop had assigned

and facts, Mr Le Meſurier found himſelf compelled to yield a faint and reluctant aſſent; but for the conceſſion he has amply conſoled himſelf by the diſcovery of an argument, which he truſts will ſtill prove the biſhop's accuſation to be perfectly correct. He tells us, that in England the writings of the infidels made no impreſſion on the great body of the inhabitants; becauſe the common people, having the word of God before their eyes, were not to be talked out of their religion. They only became miſchievous, when they were tranſlated into the languages of the countries, in which the people were debarred all acceſs to the truths of the goſpel, and their minds revolted at the ſuperſtition and frauds of the Romiſh prieſts. (*f*) Here again we have ſpeculation: let us try its accuracy by the moſt faithful of teſts, its agreement with facts. In comparing the common people in England with the common people in France, does Mr Le Meſurier take the latter as they were before, or as they were during, the revolution? In the firſt ſuppoſition, he has aſſumed that which it will be incumbent on him to prove. I have no heſitation to aſſert that, before the revolution, the writings of the infidels had made but little impreſſion on the maſs of the common people in France. Their attachment to all the

as one of his reasons for ascribing infidelity to popery, that it was liable to the objections of thinking men: and the remarker very naturally expressed his surprise that these thinking men did not, after discovering the errors of popery, discover also the truths of protestantism. Why did they prefer atheism to it? Oh! says Mr Le Mesurier, thinking does not always imply *thinking right* (p. 196). Be it so. It will only follow that, in the bishop's opinion, the thinking men, who have objections to popery, are those who do not *think right*. Pray! how did the bishop *think*, when he objected to popery, that it was derogatory from the honour of God the Father, the mediatorship of God the Son, and the sanctifying influence of God the Holy Ghost? Is he also to be excluded from the number of thinking men, who think right?

(*f*) Le Mesur. p. 197.

practices of their religion was equal, or rather it was far superior to that which is manifested at the present day by the same class in England. Whoever has witnessed the crowds, which filled on a Sunday the parish churches in France, and the scanty attendance which is generally given to them in this country, will acknowledge the truth of my assertion. The religion of the great body of the French people might be termed enthusiasm in opposition to the indifference, the cold neglect, of the common people in this kingdom.

If, on the other hand, Mr Le Mesurier meant to compare the religious conduct of the English, at the present day, with that of the French, during the revolution, the comparison was unfair. You must place each in a similar situation, before you can legitimately draw the inference. During the paroxism of revolutionary phrenzy, it was not surprising if the infidels, who had assumed the powers of government, were able, under the influence of terror, and the seduction of liberty, to persecute the ministers, and suspend for a time the exercise of religion. For this temporary desertion of their creed, the great body of the people attoned by the alacrity with which they returned to the catholic worship at the first dawn of internal tranquillity. Their subsequent conduct has shewn that the doctrines of infidelity had never taken root in their hearts. If, for the sake of argument, England instead of France had been the theatre of the revolution, and the English clergy had displayed that determined opposition to the views of the demagogues, which distinguished the French clergy, does not Mr Le Mesurier believe, that the established church also would have fallen, its dignities have been abolished, and its wealth confiscated?

Yet could he juſtly have aſcribed ſuch a cataſtrophe to the infidelity of the common people?

But, he will aſk, were not the people in France "debarred all acceſs to the truths of the goſpel, and were not their minds revolted at the ſuperſtitions and frauds of the Romiſh prieſts?" The firſt part of the interrogation alludes, I conceive, to the well-known objection reſpecting the ſcriptures in a vulgar tongue, which has been already noticed in ſeveral parts of this controverſy. Here I ſhall only add, that in moſt, perhaps in all, the dioceſes in France, the more advanced among the children were obliged, on every Sunday and many holidays, to repeat by heart in the pariſh church the epiſtle and goſpel for the day: a ſingular method of "debarring them all acceſs to the truths of the goſpel!" As to the frauds of the Romiſh prieſts, I can only pity the prejudice or the ignorance of the man who has brought the objection. A Romiſh prieſt is no longer an unknown character in this iſland. There was a time, when proteſtant liberality was allowed to paint him in the moſt hideous colours: and I have known many an orthodox churchman ſtare at a catholic clergyman, as if he were an ourang outang, or an infernal being in a human ſhape. But theſe days have paſſed away. Hundreds of Romiſh prieſts, and thoſe too from the very country to which Mr Le Meſurier alludes, have lately dwelt among us. Their moral and religious conduct has been open to the eyes of every beholder: and I am convinced that no one, who cultivated their acquaintance, will be aſhamed to aſſert, that they were as ſincere in their belief, and as incapable of fraud, as the rector of Newnton Longville or his brethren.

Were I to follow Mr Le Meſurier ſtep by ſtep, through the remaining pages of his pamphlet, I

ſhould only weary both myſelf and the reader. Of his arguments, many have been already noticed in the courſe of this controverſy; and thoſe who wiſh for more information on ſuch ſubjects, may conſult the theologians, who have profeſſedly diſcuſſed the oppoſite claims of the two churches. My object will only be to offer a few obſervations on certain paſſages, which ſtrike me as peculiarly novel, or peculiarly intereſting.

In page 201, Mr Le Meſurier has amuſed himſelf with drawing a long and tedious parallel between the real or ſuppoſed doctrines of the churches of Rome and England reſpecting the remiſſion of ſin. Now, reader, what think you is the object of this parallel? A ſingular one indeed it is: no other than to determine, which of the two holds out to her children the greateſt encouragement for the perpetration of crimes. The claim of ſuperiority, as was to be expected, he awards to the church of Rome: but, before I ſtate the reaſons on which he grounds his deciſion, I may be allowed to obſerve, that, if the catholic doctrine invites to ſin, the conduct of catholics exhibits a moral phenomenon, highly deſerving of inveſtigation. We are made, I preſume, of the ſame materials as our proteſtant neighbours; our breaſts feel the influence of the ſame paſſions; our virtue is expoſed to the ſame temptations. Thus far our circumſtances are ſimilar: but then comes the great diſcriminating difference. It is the happineſs of the proteſtant to practiſe a pure unadulterated worſhip, which unfolds to his eye the moral truths of the ſcriptures, oppoſes a ſtrong barrier to the impulſe of the paſſions, and checks the diffuſion of vice: while it is the misfortune of the catholic to profeſs a religion, which ſtudiouſly conceals the ſcriptures from the eyes of

the people, encourages sin, and urges to the gratification of illicit desires. Now, if these premises be true, what other conclusion can we draw from them, than that of all classes of Christians, the catholics must be the most depraved. But is such reasoning justified by experience? I call on the rector of Newnton Longville to make the inquiry. Let him compare the morals of the neareſt catholic congregation with the morals of his own protestant parishioners, of those who have had the happiness to receive from his own lips the saving truths of the gospel, and then let him say whether the catholics yield to them in piety or virtue. If they do not, as I trust they do not, let him endeavour to reconcile this fact with his opinion, respecting the immoral tendency of their creed. A similar invitation I have already made to two of the remarker's opponents. They have had the prudence to decline it. We shall soon learn if Mr Le Mesurier be more adventurous.

Knowing, as from my profession I must know, the true nature of the catholic worship, and convinced, as from long experience I am, that it is hostile to the existence of vice in any of its shapes, it was with much surprise that I first read Mr Le Mesurier's extraordinary assertion. I was anxious to learn on what foundation it rested; and was informed, that according to the catholic doctrine, "be you as great a sinner as you please, the church has power to absolve you, if you will but submit to the penance which she may impose." Were even such our doctrine, I might still doubt whether the inference were legitimate: but I must be allowed to ask Mr Le Mesurier, from what profession of catholic faith he drew his information? Had the assertion been only supported in one of those ephemeral sermons, which

the charity of ſome proteſtant clergymen prompts them occaſionally to preach againſt us, it might have paſſed unnoticed. From his pulpit, the rector of Newnton Longville, may pour the ſtream of his eloquence without the riſk of contradiction. There, probably, he will be oppoſed by no ſceptic who may doubt, no critic who may refute his accuſations. With gaping mouths the pious flock will devour his words, and bleſs the orthodox ſhepherd who feeds their ſouls with ſuch delectable manna. But to hazard a charge, ſo devoid of foundation, and ſo eaſy of detection, in a publication open to the peruſal both of friends and foes, is a dangerous experiment. The victims of calumny will not be ſlow to aſſert their innocence; and the man who values his character as a miniſter of the God of truth, ſhould be careful how he diſgrace it with the imputation of forgery. Far be it from me to impute to Mr Le Meſurier any intentional miſrepreſentation; but I may be permitted to lament, that neither the experience of age, nor the advantages of an academical education have been able to eradicate from his mind the prejudices of the nurſery:

> The priest continues what the nurse began,
> And thus the child imposes on the man.

The truth is, the doctrine ſo confidently aſcribed to us is not only not our doctrine, but the very oppoſite to it. We do not teach, that the church has power to abſolve the ſinner as often as he pleaſes, provided he ſubmit to the penance enjoined him; but we do teach, that no penance whatever, though even united with abſolution, will ſuffice for the remiſſion of one grievous ſin, without contrition: that is, without a true ſorrow for the offence committed againſt God, a firm reſolution of amendment, and a

disposition of mind to repair, as circumstances will permit, every injury offered to our neighbour. These are considered as conditions indispensably necessary for the forgiveness of sin. Without them we are taught that no penance, no absolution, can be of any avail. And will Mr Le Mesurier undertake to prove that such a doctrine is an encouragement to sin?

2. But the rector of Newnton Longville is not so easily satisfied. He tells us, that the catholic church "grants indulgences prospectively for sins to come;" (*g*) and chastises the insincerity of the remarker who had preserved the most obstinate silence on that head.—It is no difficult task to vindicate the remarker. He knew that indulgences for sins to come are only ideal beings, that exist no where but in the writings of our adversaries: that they are no more than spectres, conjured up by religious bigotry, to frighten the imagination of the vulgar; or rather, that they are, to use the words of the late Mr Fox on a similar subject, no better than "good, sound, protestant lies." But will it be so easy to vindicate the conduct of Mr Le Mesurier? How will he apologize for his adoption of this antiquated forgery? Will he say that he had not sufficiently examined the subject, or that he retailed the calumny on the authority of others? If so, let me advise him to add the following maxim to his collection of controversial canons, that "it is a breach of common honesty, either to advance an accusation against any man, or body of men, without having examined into its truth, or to repeat it, when it has been proved to be false, and without foundation." (*h*)

(*g*) Le Mesur. p. 202.
(*h*) Aikin, Annual Review for 1806, p. 595.

3. Mr Le Meſurier has a third and ſtill more powerful argument in reſerve. He hopes to ſilence his adverſary by the teſtimony of a book, which has long been the pride of the bigot and the polemic; has often reddened with ſhame the cheek of the moſt obdurate papiſt; and, what is of ſtill more utility to mankind, has furniſhed the learned, pious, and viſionary Mr Granville Sharp with a key to unlock to aſtoniſhed mortals the ſecrets contained in the book of Revelations. (*i*) This book, ſo pregnant with important conſequences, is the Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ, or a tariff of the prices at which ſins may be redeemed in the Roman chancery, the great cuſtom houſe of human guilt. If the reader will be at the trouble to peruſe the different articles of this valuable code, he will at leaſt acknowledge, that the pope is extremely moderate in his demands, and wonder, that his holineſs has not employed a Britiſh financier to improve the receipts of his treaſury. In England, you cannot obtain a licenſe to keep a ſetting dog, without paying a tax of ten ſhillings: at Rome, it ſeems, a man may murder his father, and enjoy his eſtate, for the payment of the ſame duty. Here, one and twenty ſhillings are demanded for permiſſion to powder your hair once in twelve months: there, for an equal ſum, you may keep a miſtreſs, without endangering your ſalvation. However, ſhould Mr Le Meſurier, or his friend, ſtray as far as Rome, I would not have them rely with too much confidence on the Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ; they might find themſelves in the ſame unpleaſant ſituation as the Roman nobleman, mentioned by O'Leary, who, when he was accuſed of having three wives living at the ſame time,

(*i*) See Observations, &c. at the end.

attempted to juſtify his conduct by obſerving, that he had not been able to meet with one with whom he could be happy. "Since it is ſo difficult," replied the pontiff, Sixtus Quintus, "to pleaſe you in this world, you ſhall go and try your fortune in the other. There women are more numerous, and you may find one to your liking." The Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ could not ſave him. He was tried for polygamy, and executed.

The Roman chancery is a very ancient eſtabliſhment, the regulations of which were originally formed by John XXII., and brought into their preſent form by Nicholas V. At the death of each pope theſe regulations are ſuppoſed to expire: but his ſucceſſor is always careful to revive them; and thus they remain, at the preſent day, ſtubſtantially the ſame as they were ſome centuries ago. From them, the Regulæ Cancellariæ Romanæ, it appears that the cauſes brought before that tribunal, regard the temporalities of vacant biſhoprics; the collation, permutation, or reſignation of benefices; abſolutions from canonical cenſures; and diſpenſations from the canonical impediments of marriage. With the guilt of ſin the Roman chancery has no concern whatever. All its abſolutions are ſtiled in foro externo: they regard only the puniſhments inflicted by the canons; and of courſe all the reaſonings and accuſations, the pious invectives, and indignant exclamations, to which the contrary ſuppoſition has given birth, are the offſpring of error or fiction. It is indeed true, that, for the tranſaction of buſineſs in the papal chancery, as well as in the eccleſiaſtical courts in England, fees have been required by the officers; but theſe are not paid as the price of ſin, but for the expedition of buſineſs. This circumſtance, however, furniſhed a uſeful hint to ſome of

the fathers of the reformation, who had no objection to a pious fraud, when it might promote the godly work in which they were engaged. The Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ were ingeniously corrected, interpolated, and enlarged: the improved copy was circulated by the reformers as a proof that Rome was the great cuſtom-houſe of ſin; and the cheat was greedily devoured by the prejudices of their diſciples. (*k*) That during a period of religious ferment it ſhould have obtained credit in England, cannot excite ſurpriſe: but I had thought that in the preſent enlightened age it had been conſigned to the contempt which it deſerves. Even from Guthrie's geography, in which it retained an honourable place during ſo many editions, it has recently been expunged by the liberality of the publiſhers; and I am happy to obſerve, that its preſent exiſtence entirely depends on the credit of the firm of Meſſrs Le Meſurier, Granville Sharp, & Co.

(*k*) The principal protestant editions of the Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ are those given by Pinet and Banck, and both were censured as spurious at Rome and Madrid, and one of them by the archbishop of Paris. Bayle (and, I believe, it is to Bayle, either mediately or immediately, that most of our adversaries are indebted for the knowledge which they display on this important subject) observes, that it is difficult to explain the great differences between these two editions, and to understand the real value of the monies which they mention. He adds, that there are also several editions given by catholics at Paris and Cologne: but he, it appears, was never able to meet with any one copy of them. I have been equally unfortunate. I have, however, read the Regulæ Cancellariæ, printed in 1484, and several other editions from that period to the close of the last century, and in none of them have I met with a single word respecting absolution from sin. I have also examined the fees which are really permitted to be taken by the officers of that court, and find that none of them regard any other absolutions than those from canonical censures. They are demanded as a remuneration for trouble. (Quæ solvuntur pro litterarum expeditionibus, communiter dicuntur Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ. Van Espen, p. 248.) I should conceive that, whatever may be the opinion of Mr Le Mesurier, those who have had to pay these fees, have seldom thought that they were inducements to sin. Probably they would adopt the opposite opinion.

It may not, perhaps, be thought impertinent to the preſent ſubject, to adduce one inſtance of the manner, in which the powers intruſted to the Roman chancery, have been exerciſed in England ſince its ſeparation from the apoſtolic ſee. In the year 1621, Dr George Abbot, the archbiſhop of Canterbury, was invited by the Lord Zouch to hunt in his park of Bramzil, in Hampſhire. The moſt reverend primate might be a learned theologian: (*l*) he ſoon proved that he was an indifferent marksman. With a croſs-bow he took his aim at a deer, and ſhot the keeper of the park, Peter Hawkins, who, within the ſpace of an hour, died of the wound. The unfortunate accident threw the whole church of England into confuſion. Many thought that, by the homicide the archbiſhop had incurred the canonical puniſhment of irregularity; and theſe contended that it was his duty to reſign a dignity, the function of which he was no longer able to diſcharge. But to the primate himſelf, this doctrine ſeemed to ſavour of popery: he boldly undertook to refute their opinion, and was ſtrenuouſly ſupported by two powerful advocates, Sir Henry Martin, and the biſhop of Wincheſter. They maintained, that the accident could not be aſcribed either to the negligence or the unſkilfulneſs of the archbiſhop, but was owing entirely to the imprudence of the unfortunate man, who blindly ran into the way of the arrow: that by the charter of foreſts the Engliſh prelates were allowed the pleaſures of the chaſe: and that the hunting forbidden by the canons was, not like that

(*l*) Lord Clarendon obſerves that "he was a man of very morose manners and sour aspect, totally ignorant of the true constitution of the church of England; considering the christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled popery; and valuing those men most that did it most furiously."

of Dr Abbot, modeſt, decent, and peaceable, but clamorous and public. Theſe contradictory arguments perplexed even the theological diſcernment of king James: and to relieve his own doubts, he appointed a commiſſion of biſhops, judges, and lawyers, to examine the caſe of the primate, and to repeat to him their opinion. They met, conſulted, and diſagreed. After much deliberation their anſwer was, that the archbiſhop ſhould be abſolved conditionally, ad majorem cautelam. But here an unexpected difficulty aroſe. Who but the king, the ſupreme head of the church, could pretend to exerciſe any ſpiritual authority over the primate of all England? And yet, who had ever heard of a layman pretending to abſolve an eccleſiaſtic from canonical cenſures? To extricate themſelves from this dilemma, they petitioned the king to depute a certain number of clergymen, who might pronounce the ſentence of abſolution in his name: conceiving, I imagine, that the authority of a layman might derive ſomething of a ſpiritual character by paſſing through the mouth of an eccleſiaſtic. James granted their prayer: a royal commiſſion was directed to eight biſhops: and theſe prelates, according to their inſtructions, abſolved the archbiſhop from all canonical cenſures and irregularities which he might have incurred, reſtored his character, and permitted him to enter again on the exerciſe of his archiepiſcopal functions. Their ſentence received the king's confirmation, and paſſed the ſeals about ſix months after the death of Peter Hawkins. (*m*)

What ſum of money this royal bull of abſolution may have coſt the primate, I am unable to deter-

(*m*) Wilkins Conc. Mag. Brit. tom. iv. p. 462. Collier. Church Hiſt. tom. ii. p. 720. Le Neve, Lives, &c. of Protestant Biſhops, vol. i. p. 98.

mine: but that it was not engroſſed, ſigned, and ſealed, without the payment of the accuſtomed fees, will not be doubted by any one acquainted with the practices of our courts. Now were a catholic writer to take advantage of this circumſtance, and to contend that the king, as ſupreme head of the church, was accuſtomed to abſolve from the guilt of murder for a ſmall ſum of money, were he to deſcribe England as the great custom-houſe of crimes, were he to exclaim with the pathetic vehemence of Mr Granville Sharp, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her ſins;" would he not deſerve the appellation of a mad-man or a ſlanderer? If ſo, will the rector of Newnton Longville tell us, what name to give to the proteſtant writer, who, on ſimilar and no better grounds, prefers the ſame accuſations againſt the church of Rome? *All things whatſoever ye would that men ſhould do to you, do ye even ſo to them.*

In page 203, Mr Le Meſurier proceeds to lament, with the feelings of true orthodox charity, the deplorable thraldom in which our intellects are detained by the deſpotiſm of the church of Rome. "No layman, "and not even a prieſt, is allowed to read the ſcrip- "tures in the language of his country, ſtill leſs any "book of controverſy, not this note of mine, with- "out a licenſe from his biſhop." Bravo, Mr Le Meſurier!—It is certainly a proud ſuperiority this, which the freeman of the reformation is ſuppoſed to poſſeſs over the ſlave of popery. While the latter is condemned to view the promiſed land from a diſtance, the former may wander at pleaſure from the book of Geneſis to the book of Revelations, may aſcend the tower of Babel, meaſure with Ezechiel the dimenſions of the ſecond temple, and witneſs the deſtruction of the ſcarlet w—— of Babylon.

Through the ſacred volumes he may trace the numerous errors of the human intellect, and ſucceſsfully pore over the different texts, on which every new ſyſtem of religion has been founded from the days of the arch-reformer Simon Magus, to his laſt deſcendant, Joanna Southgate, the female prophet, who now vends the knowledge of futurity in London. Let him, however, exerciſe his privilege with moderation; let him be cautious how he plucks the flower which invites him.

Urticæ proxima sæpe rosa est.

Should our evangelical Caräite unfortunately diſcover in the inſpired writings any doctrines, which accord not with the ſtandard of eſtabliſhed orthodoxy, adieu to the liberty of the children of God.—He muſt ſubmit his judgment to the infallible deciſions of his church, or he muſt forfeit, what many men will prefer to the exerciſe of their judgment, the civil rights to which, as an Engliſhman, he is entitled by his birth. So erroneous was that ſaying of our redeemer, *my kingdom is not of this world.*

Let not Mr Le Meſurier, however, ſuppoſe that I ſhall grant the truth of his aſſertion. It is one of the many miſtakes into which thoſe frequently fall, who ſtudy books inſtead of facts; and judge of the preſent practices of catholics from the bold aſſertions of prejudiced controvertiſts, who lived a century ago. In defiance of his prohibition the catholics, both laymen and eccleſiaſtics, do read, and will continue to read, the ſacred volumes even in their native tongue. But how, perhaps it may be aſked, are we then to account for the contrary aſſertion ſo frequently and ſo confidently made by our adverſaries? I conceive it muſt be an Oxfordiſm, a theological axiom, which is taken for granted, to ſpare the

labour of enquiry. To doubt its truth would mar many a controverſial ſermon, and deprive the preacher of an eloquent triumph over the ſuperſtitions of popery. But were Mr Le Meſurier to enquire of his next catholic neighbour, he would learn that this axiom is, like many other axioms, admitted only becauſe its truth has not been examined.

To his obſervation reſpecting the prohibition of books of controverſy, the ſame anſwer may ſuffice. I am, however, happy in being able to relieve his anxiety reſpecting his own works. The church of Rome is not ſo impolitic as to forbid the peruſal of writings which are ſo favourable to her cauſe. If ever ſhe condeſcend to notice the controverſial lucubrations of the rector of Newnton Longville, it will be to recommend them to the peruſal of her children. For catholics, when they obſerve one of their moſt eager opponents directing his fierceſt attacks againſt imaginary articles of their creed, will naturally infer, that if he has ſpared their real principles, it has been becauſe he felt himſelf unable to refute them. The power might, the will could not be wanting.

It cannot have eſcaped the notice of the attentive reader, how frequently, ſince the very commencement of this controverſy, doctrines have been aſcribed to us, which we moſt emphatically diſclaim. Had not the hiſtory of mankind explained the baneful influence of the odium theologicum, how rapidly it obſcures the underſtanding, and palſies all the more generous feelings, it might have been expected that our reverend and right reverend opponents, men, who from their education and their rank in life ſhould be, and on other occaſions are, liberal, diſpaſſionate, and enlightened, would take the trouble to ſtudy our religious belief, before they attempt

to refute it. Yet ſo it happens, that they generally chuſe to frame for us ſuch a creed as they think proper, and then inſiſt on our admitting it as our own, whether we be willing or not. How far this may be reconcileable with theological ſincerity, I ſhall not determine: it is certainly an ingenious and politic device. It eſtabliſhes a kind of barter, without any reciprocity of riſk. The profit is all theirs: the loſs muſt fall upon us. They take from us our civil rights, and in return give us erroneous articles of faith. All the emoluments, all the honours in the ſtate, they confine to themſelves: and then very charitably bid us to conſole ourſelves with the belief of the abſurd and impious doctrines, which they have ſo liberally beſtowed on us.

When we claim the faculty of knowing what it is we believe, we certainly aſk but little. Yet this little is refuſed us. Our opponents arrogate to themſelves a privilege which no pontiff ever dared to claim, even in the proudeſt days of the papal power. The ſucceſſors of St Peter might decide what each catholic *was bound* to believe. N. B. Theſe new inquiſitors decide what each catholic actually *does* and *ſhall* believe. The pontiff might define, but he could not compel the aſſent of the underſtanding: theſe men define, and will not allow us even the power of diſſent.

Their infallibility extends over all our faculties, both phyſical and moral. The papiſt muſt neceſſarily be, whatever they may pleaſe to repreſent him. To diſclaim the falſe and odious tenets which they have added to our creed, is an idle, hopeleſs taſk.—They laugh at our proteſtations, and condemn us of inſincerity. Among the graces of their ordination, they appear to have received the peculiar privilege of penetrating into our breaſts, of diſcovering our

moſt ſecret ſentiments, of analyzing and expoſing the hidden motives of our conduct. To every argument which we adduce, they haughtily and tauntingly reply, that we are ſhifters and equivocators, and that, as it ſuits our convenience, we can diſguiſe or diſown each article of our creed. (*n*) Whence they have learned to form ſo unfavourable a notion of our character, I ſhall not inquire: but if it be well-founded, we muſt have been bunglers indeed, not to have eſcaped that load of penal reſtrictions, and legal diſabilities, which their intolerance has heaped upon us. Were I diſpoſed to retaliate, I would deſire the rector of Newnton Longville to look for inſtances of inſincerity, ſhuffling, and equivocation, not among the catholic writers, but in another claſs of men, among whom, if report belie them not, there are thoſe, who have been accuſtomed to make religion a matter of calculation, to weigh tithes againſt ſubſcriptions, and to eſtimate the orthodoxy of a creed by the amount of its temporal emoluments. But peace to the errors and weakneſſes of human nature, when they do not wound the feelings, nor trample on the rights of others.—Were the doctrinal forgeries of our adverſaries of this innoxious character, we ſhould not complain. Their falſe notes might be permitted to circulate without interruption for the edification of the illiterate, and the amuſement of the learned. They might then call for unlimited credit: they might draw to any amount on the ignorance or the prejudices of the public. But when their only object is to ſtop the current of national juſtice and national liberality, to deprive of their civil rights millions of

(*n*) Le Meſurier's reply, p. 39, 42, 52, 197, &c. The remarker has no reason to complain of such language, as he must share it with other writers more distinguished than himself.

his majeſty's ſubjects as loyal as themſelves, and to degrade them beneath a level with the meaneſt of their proteſtant countrymen, their miſrepreſentations become an evil of the moſt alarming tendency, and deſerve the execration of every honeſt man.

In his laſt page, Mr Le Meſurier adviſes the biſhop of Durham to reprint ſome of the old tracts againſt popery. I am not ſurpriſed at it. He would be proud to appear in the company of his elder brethren, the controvertiſts of a former age. Pares cum paribus, veteri proverbio, facillime congregantur. Unfortunately he was born a century too late. The books, which he ſo much admires, have long lain covered with duſt on the ſhelves of our libraries: and there, it is probable, they will continue to lie

Like rusty mail in monumental mockery.

At the preſent day Engliſhmen are, I truſt, too wiſe to fight with each other for modes of faith.—They would rather unite men of every religious perſuaſion to oppoſe the deſigns of a bold, powerful, and fortunate enemy, who, with all Europe at his beck, threatens our very exiſtence as an independent nation. Let Mr Meſurier devote his abilities to this purpoſe, and he will deſerve the gratitude of his country. As long as he continues to employ himſelf in collecting the ſuperannuated follies of ancient polemics, and in republiſhing them to diſturb the harmony, and conſequently to divide the ſtrength of the nation, his readers will be inclined to throw down his book, and to exclaim with the poet,

Hunc tu, Romane, caveto.

REPLY

TO

THE REV. G. S. FABER,

VICAR OF STOCKTON.

IT is truly edifying to obſerve the alacrity with which the clergy of the dioceſe of Durham continue to eſpouſe the defence of the biſhop's charge. Formerly, that prelate thought it his duty to accuſe them of lukewarmneſs and indifference (*a*): now, at leaſt, he muſt recal his cenſure, and applaud the zeal and promptitude of their exertions. To the other adverſaries of the remarker, has lately been added, a new, and more celebrated champion,—the Rev. G. S. Faber, B. D., and vicar of Stockton upon Tees. This gentleman is certainly at liberty to ſelect, for the exerciſe of his abilities, any ſubjects which ſuit his judgment or inclination: but I think that the reputation which he has already acquired, cannot be improved by his interference in the petty ſquabbles excited by an epiſcopal charge. Prophecy, not controverſy, is Mr Faber's peculiar department. In his progreſs through that region of miſt and darkneſs, he has outſtripped the ſpeed of all his competitors. By his profound acquaintance with the helio-arkite mythology of the Cabiri, and the hieroglyphic language of the Apocalypſe, he has

(*a*) Charge, p. 21.

already explained to the world the myſteries of the times paſt, of the time preſent, and of the time to come: (*b*) the ſucceſs of his preceding exertions are an earneſt of what we may expect in future; and his admirers will regret that a ſingle moment of his time has been withdrawn from the purſuit of objects, *ſo intereſting to the credulity of the pious and orthodox churchman.*

It is, indeed, true that, in his pamphlet, the remarker had named Mr Faber; but he had named him with reſpect. He had given him, what it had long been his object to acquire, the title of a prophet; and had aſſigned to him a taſk the moſt congenial to his ſtudies, the explication of a myſtery. He did not wiſh to entangle him in the webs of controverſial ſophiſtry, but to open to him a new field for the excurſions of his fancy. He had invited him to explain the meaning of a new myſtery, which is not, indeed, to be found in the Cabirian mythology, or the canonical books of ſcripture, but which is frequently announced, with conſiderable energy, in the ſermons and charges of the biſhop of Durham. We read, in the Apocalypſe, of a woman in the heavens who brought forth a man-child, and then fled into the wilderneſs, where ſhe was fed during the ſpace of 1260 days, or perhaps years: we read, in the works of the Right Rev. Prelate, of another woman who, though ſhe became pregnant with infidelity at a very early period, did not bring forth her child till after a geſtation of more than ten centuries. Mr Faber had very ſatisfactorily explained the myſtery of the apocalyptic woman; and the remarker had hoped that the myſtery of the

(*b*) See Mr Faber's great works, The Myſteries of the Cabiri, and The Prophecies that have been fulfilled, are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled, &c. &c. 4 vol octavo.

retarded parturition in the second woman, would have been as easily elucidated by his experience and ingenuity. He has, however, declined the task. He seems to think, with the remarker, that a millennian period of gestation bears a very portentous aspect; and therefore willingly acquits popery of the imputation of being naturally pregnant with atheism. (*c*) He rather leans to the opinion of Andrew Fuller, "who justly deems infidelity to be a putrid excrescence of the papal beast." (*d*) With the works of "this very able" genealogist, I have neither the means nor the inclination to be very intimately acquainted; but from the preceding specimen, I have no doubt that he was a writer of most correct taste, and most delicate feelings. Mr Faber's own opinion, however, is, that "infidelity may, *in some sense*, be called the abortive offspring of popery, because sceptical inquiry produced it, by acting on the corruptions of popery." (*e*) Now, in almost every history of the reformation, I find the same origin assigned to protestantism; and, as I cannot believe protestantism and infidelity to be the same thing, I must conclude that they are twin brothers, both "the abortive offspring of popery." Thus, then, whatever may become of the millennian gestation, it appears that, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, at the age of a thousand years, according to the imputation of her adversaries, the old lady unexpectedly found herself the parent of two blooming boys, protestantism and infidelity. Nor does the birth of this "par nobile fratrum," appear to have been unnoticed by

(*c*) Mr Faber says, that the passage which he quoted from the charge, only asserted the revolutionary spirit to be, *in a great measure*, owing to the errors and defects of popery. In the passages to which the remarker referred, the learned prelate seems to assert something more.

(*d*) Faber, Answer to Bicheno, &c. p. 92. (*e*) Ibid.

the ancient prophets. Whether any alluſion to it exiſt in the helio-arkite mythology, Mr Faber alone can tell us: but it has certainly been predicted in the Apocalypſe by the two horns growing out of the head of the beaſt.

It is, however, "*in ſome ſenſe*" only, that Mr Faber calls infidelity the offspring of popery. He therefore proceeds to inform us, that the true parent is ſocinianiſm. But whence did ſocinianiſm derive its origin? It is on this point that the vicar of Stockton joins iſſue with the remarker; and while that writer deſcribes the principles of ſocinianiſm as a direct emanation from the principles of proteſtantiſm, *he* contends that they come from a very different quarter, that they are the handywork of catholicity. For this very extraordinary aſſertion, he refers us to the authority of Moſheim; without reflecting, that the authority of Moſheim has very little weight with thoſe who, from the tendency of the errors which abound in his work, have learned to eſteem him rather as the advocate of a party, than the champion of truth. Yet what does Mr Faber collect from the pages of this hiſtorian? That the formation and eſtabliſhment of ſocinianiſm were entirely owing to the labours of Lælius and Fauſtus Socinus; and that theſe new apoſtles were Italians; the former of whom, before he had converſed with the reformers, was compelled in 1547 to retire from his country, on account of the diſguſt he had conceived againſt popery: whence he concludes, that the origin of ſocinianiſm cannot be laid to the charge of proteſtantiſm. (*f*) Mr Faber, however, muſt excuſe me if I heſitate to ſubſcribe either to the accuracy of his ſtatement, or to the validity of his inference. That

(*f*) Faber's Answer.

the ſocinians derive their name from Lælius and Fauſtus Socinus, the uncle and the nephew, but principally from the latter, is indeed true; it ſhould, however, be remembered, that their principles are older than their name; and that before the birth of the elder Socinus, Luther had complained of the audacity of ſeveral among his diſciples, who, uſurping the privilege of their maſter, had eraſed from their creed the two great myſteries of the trinity of God, and the redemption of mankind. Whether Lælius Socinus, before he left Italy, had converſed with any of the reformers, is what probably neither Mr Faber nor the remarker can determine. That their writings were then known in that country, is certain; and that the "diſguſt of Socinus againſt the doctrines of popery" was derived from them, is at leaſt highly probable. After ſpending four years in different countries, and in the company of the moſt celebrated of the reformers, the Italian fixed his reſidence at Geneva. Here, by improving the doctrine of his maſters, he ſoon learned to reject the myſteries which they ſtill retained: but the flames that conſumed Servetus, taught him to reſpect the ſtern infallibility of Calvin, and he was prudently ſatisfied with the ſilent belief of his own creed, without preſuming to illuminate the minds of his brethren. The letters, however, which he occaſionally wrote to the members of his family in Italy, procured a few converts to his opinions; among whom the moſt celebrated was his nephew, Fauſtus. At his uncle's death, this young man became heir to his papers; and, after ſpending ten years at the court of Florence, formed the deſign of announcing to the world the theological diſcoveries of his uncle, improved and perfected by himſelf. With this view he left Italy, where he had reaſon to fear the in-

credulity of the inquisition, as much as Lælius had feared the zeal of Calvin at Geneva. Switzerland was the first theatre of his labours; from Switzerland he proceeded to Transylvania; and thence, in 1579, passed into Poland. Poland was, at that period, the scene of religious dissention. Among the reformed churches within its limits, were reckoned no less than thirty different sects of Anti-trinitarians. To these Faustus applied; and, after many fruitless negociations, succeeded in collecting the most considerable into one society, in which his talents and credit gave him the most distinguished place, and the members of which afterwards assumed from him the name of socinians.

But, to judge of the origin of religious sects, we are not to look to the country in which some of their teachers may chance to have been born, but to the principles which they are acknowledged to profess. In the catechism of Racow, published by Socinus himself, we are told that the first, the most essential principle of their doctrine is, that the holy scriptures, interpreted by the private judgment of each individual, are the sole rule of faith. Now as this is the very doctrine which Luther promulgated, the very privilege which he claimed, when he first separated from the church of Rome many years before the birth of Socinus, I think I may be justified when I assert that the latter was indebted to *him* for the very foundation of his religious creed; and that of consequence the socinians are the legitimate children of the reformation. It is indeed true, that Faustus pushed the principles of his teachers to their full extent: that, with heroic intrepidity, he embraced every consequence naturally deducible from them: and that, while other religious innovators stopped short in their career, he was consistent with himself,

and continued to argue and reject till scarcely a single doctrine remained, which had formerly been thought peculiar to christianity. But hence it will not follow that he was descended from a different stock from his reforming colleagues. The only inference we can draw is, that he was a bold, stubborn, and undutiful child, who knew the privileges of his birthright, and would not be deprived of them by the frowns or prohibitions of an unreasonable parent. His exploits were thus recorded in his epitaph :—

> Tota quidem Babylon destruxit tecta Lutherus,
> Muros Calvinus, sed fundamenta Socinus. (*g*)

From the origin of infidelity, Mr Faber proceeds to the charge of idolatry. In support of his own opinion, and that of his bishop, he transcribes with an air of triumph certain extracts from prayers contained in the Sarum Missal, once in use in this kingdom. They were originally collected by the orthodox zeal of his apocalyptic rival, Mr Whitaker, and may be found among the two hundred pages which that interpreter of the book of Revelations has very wisely devoted to the exposition of the corruptions

(*g*) To strengthen his reasoning on this subject, Mr Faber gives his reader from Mosheim a list of persons, mostly Frenchmen and Italians, whom he considers as infidels; and mentions a report that "in certain provinces of France and Italy, schools were erected, from whence swarms of impious doctors issued out to deceive the simple and unwary." As these swarms of infidels, if they had ever existed, would have been easily traced to their hives, and the existence of these hives is only asserted on hearsay, we may reasonably consider them as the fabrications of prejudice or imposture. Of the names which he has mentioned, the greater part belong to men, who are well known to have lived and died in the christian faith—But what has this to do with the real point at issue between the bishop and the remarker. The latter had asserted, in answer to the bishop, that the French infidels had learned their unbelieving system from the English deists and atheists. Will Mr Faber undertake to prove that the latter were the disciples of popery?

of popery: and here I may be allowed to admire the ingenuity of our proteſtant adverſaries who, when they extract from our books of devotion, what they deem objectionable paſſages, are careful to ſuppreſs every expreſſion which might elucidate their true meaning. (*b*) I acknowledge that the prayers tranſcribed by Mr Faber, as they ſtand unconnected in his pages, appear to aſcribe to the ſaints more than can with juſtice be given to them: but I alſo maintain, that had Mr Whitaker tranſcribed other prayers, which he muſt have found in the ſame book, they would have explained the meaning of the former, and have ſhewn that it was eaſily reconcileable with the doctrine laid down by the remarker. If I prove this to be true, it will be in vain that Mr Faber has pointed the horns of his dilemma againſt that author. They may both be broken at a ſingle ſtroke.

I have it not in my power to conſult the Sarum Miſſal at the preſent moment; but truſt that the Sarum Portiforium, printed at London in 1555, and uſed in the ſame church, will be admitted as equal authority. From it I ſhall tranſcribe two prayers, which I have ſelected from ſeveral others of ſimilar import, for no other reaſon than becauſe they are addreſſed to the ſame ſaints as two of thoſe adduced by Mr Faber. "Holy Mary, ſuccour the miſerable, "help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, "pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make "ſupplication for the devout female ſex. Let all "feel thy help, who celebrated thy holy memory. "Be it thy care to pray aſſiduouſly for the people of "God, as it has been thy happineſs to bear the re-"deemer of the world, Chriſt Jeſus our Lord."— "Holy Alban, protormartyr of the Engliſh, pour

(*b*) Faber's Answer.

" forth thy prayers to the Lord for the safety of the " faithful. Amen."—Whatever Mr Faber may think of the prayers quoted by him, I trust he will acknowledge that in these nothing more is requested than the friendly and charitable intercession of those to whom they are addressed. Now the person, who intercedes for a benefit, is essentially different from him who bestows it. The two ideas are so distinct, that they cannot be confounded. As long as I consider the saints as intercessors for grace and salvation, I cannot consider them as the bestowers of grace and salvation. Hence it seems to follow that, if the prayers quoted above have the meaning which I have affixed to them, the others must be explained agreeable to that meaning: and protestants should learn what catholics well know, that in every petition to the saints, whatever may be asked, their intercession is always expressed or understood. To consider them as the sources of grace, or the bestowers of favours, is a doctrine reprobated by the catholic no less than the protestant church: nor do we even believe that their intercession can be of any avail, but through the merits of Christ, their and our saviour, their and our God.

Still, perhaps, it may be asked, can such prayers as those quoted by Mr Faber, have the meaning which I contend ought to be given to them? This question can only come from one who has been inattentive to the ordinary use of language. By a species of metonomy we frequently employ the subordinate for the principal agent, and attribute to the intercessor what we know is the office of his superior. Let us suppose a criminal under sentence of death, who solicits the queen to obtain his pardon from the king. Were he in his petition to beg of her majesty *to save his life*, would Mr Faber contend

that he had aſcribed to the queen the power which the conſtitution has intruſted to the ſovereign alone, and on that account indict him for miſpriſion of treaſon, or a contempt of the king's prerogative?—Undoubtedly he would not. Let him only apply the ſame rule to the catholic prayers which he has condemned in his pamphlet, and he will readily acquit them of the guilt of idolatry.

Mr Faber, in his theological ſtudies, has choſen for his maſter a viſionary writer of the ſeventeenth century, whoſe orthodox imagination, aided by his hatred of popery, enabled him to make new diſcoveries in almoſt every page of the ſacred writings. Treading in the footſteps of Mede, he informs us that the praying to departed ſaints to intercede with God for us is neither more nor leſs than the revival of the old pagan theology of interceding demons, and *is* of conſequence an apoſtacy from the faith. (*i*) Is Mr Faber aware of the effects of the ſentence which he has juſt pronounced. The cuſtom of ſoliciting the interceſſion of the ſaints is, in my opinion, as old as chriſtianity: our adverſaries acknowledge that it was generally eſtabliſhed in the beginning of the fourth century. It was then, even by their own account, practiſed by many of the martyrs, who laid down their lives in the cauſe of the goſpel; by all the holy and zealous miſſionaries, who, by their preaching, converted to the faith our barbarous forefathers, the Saxons, the Franks, the Goths, the Lombards, &c.; by all who, during the eleven centuries preceding the reformation, had learned to bend the knee at the name of Jeſus; and, with the exception of a few proteſtant churches, by every chriſtian in the world, who has exiſted

(*i*) Faber's Answer, p. 103.

ſince that period. 'I mention not this as an appeal to authority; but I do it to expreſs my ſurpriſe, that any individual ſhould preſume, on his private authority, to cut off ſo large a portion of mankind from the fold of Chriſt, by pronouncing all of them to have been apoſtates from the faith of the goſpel. What pontiff ever aſſumed a power equal to that of the vicar of Stockton! Involved in the ſame guilt, and the ſame unhappineſs with ſo many millions of my brethren, I may be allowed to aſk in their name and my own, on what grounds this damning ſentence has been pronounced. The demons, he replies, were the ſouls of the illuſtrious dead, whoſe office was interceſſion between God and man: conſequently to attribute a ſimilar office to the ſaints, is a revival of the pagan worſhip. Without admitting this account of the demons to be perfectly accurate, I may ſtill doubt the validity of the inference which is adduced from it: and enquire whether Mr Faber be prepared to aſſert that every reſemblance between the rites and doctrine of a chriſtian people, and the rites and doctrines of the pagan nations, be neceſſarily a revival of idolatrous worſhip, and an apoſtacy from the doctrine of the goſpel. If he be, I hope he will not confine his reaſoning to the chriſtians in communion with the biſhop of Rome, but have the candour to extend it to every ſociety to which it may apply. He will then, perhaps, diſcover that by his rule proteſtant churches are a revival of pagan temples, the proteſtant hierarchy a revival of the pagan prieſthood, and the ſpiritual ſupremacy of the king a revival of the pontificial power aſſumed by the pagan emperor. In the ſervice of the eſtabliſhed church, he will learn that the feſtival kept in memory of the reſtoration of royalty in the perſon of Charles II. is an

imitation of the feſtival inſtituted in pagan Rome under the name of regifugium, in memory of the eſtabliſhment of Roman liberty: that the prayers in thankſgiving for the arrival of king William, are a tranſcript of thoſe uſed at the Pagan Bohedromia, to celebrate the arrival of Ion in Attica, to preſerve the liberties of the Athenians: that the faſt days annually appointed by the king are copied from the Feriæ imperativæ, anciently appointed by the pagan Pontifex Maximus: and that the days of thankſgiving in honour of ſplendid victories are a revival of the pagan ſupplications formerly decreed on ſimilar occaſions by the Roman ſenate. Indeed, were Mr Faber's principle once admitted, I hardly know where we ſhould be able to ſtop. Our bench of biſhops would be the pagan college of Pontifices, our agricultural ſocieties the pagan Fratres Ambarvales, and our electioneering war-whoop of *no popery* the pagan cry of *Chriſtianos ad leonem*, which ſo often reſounded in the amphitheatres. In ſhort, we ſhould ſoon be transformed into a nation of pagans.

To confirm his reaſoning Mr Faber informs us, that this apoſtacy of the catholic church was foretold by St Paul, who wrote to his diſciple Timothy, that "in latter times ſome ſhould depart from the faith, giving heed to ſeducing ſpirits, and *doctrines reſpecting interceding demons.*" The laſt words are Mr Faber's tranſlation of διδασκαλιαι δαιμονιων (*k*).

> Happy, who can this talking trumpet ſeize:
> They make it ſpeak whatever ſenſe they please.
> 'Twas fram'd at firſt Oracle t' inquire;
> But ſince each ſect in prophecy grows higher,
> The text inſpires not them, but they the text inſpire.
>
> DRYDEN.

It was not, indeed, my good fortune to ſtudy in any of the proteſtant univerſities, among thoſe who

(*k*) Faber's Anſwer, p. 103.

have acquired so much glory by "their labours in editing the Greek Testament." At an early age I was compelled to quit my native country, and to seek the advantages of education in one of those foreign catholic universities, in which we learn from the bishop of Durham, that ancient and sacred learning languish in a state of the utmost depression (*l*). However, even there, I was able to glean sufficient information to know that Mr Faber's version, or interpretation, is far from being accurate. How will he prove that διδασκαλιαι δαιμονιων mean *doctrines concerning interceding demons?* The obvious signification of the words is, *the teachings of demons:* of their intercession the apostle says nothing: for that improvement the sacred text is indebted to the ingenuity of Mr Faber. Neither is there any shadow of a proof that the demons, mentioned by the apostle, are the souls of the illustrious dead: the following verses shew that they are false teachers, actually alive, and employed in the office of seduction: εν υποκρισει ψευδολογων, κεκαυτηριασμενων την ιδιαν συνειδησιν, κωλυοντων γαμειν, &c. *who speak lies in hypocrisy, have their consciences seared, forbid to marry,* &c. Had Mr Faber confined himself to the common English version, his mistake might have been excusable. There the sense is ambiguous. In the Greek text it is plain. The participles in the second and third verses cannot agree with τινες, but must be referred to δαιμονιων: and consequently point out the demons as the living authors, not the dead objects, of the condemned doctrine (*m*).

(*l*) Charge p. 18.

(*m*) I know an attempt has been made to translate εν υποκρισει ψευδολογων, *through the hypocrisy of false teachers;* but this meaning is forced, unnatural, and unnecessary.

I muſt apologize to the reader's patience for adding another obſervation on this unintereſting ſubject; but it has acquired importance from the confidence with which the words of the apoſtle are quoted by our apocalyptic adverſaries. I have already ſhewn that, if by our doctrine reſpecting the interceſſion of the ſaints we are apoſtates, the whole body of chriſtians during at leaſt eleven centuries, and the great majority of chriſtians during the three laſt centuries, muſt be involved in the ſame guilt. Now I aſk, whether it be poſſible to apply the prediction of the apoſtle to ſo numerous a body, to ſo many hundred millions of the profeſſors of the chriſtian name? Does St Paul ſay that all chriſtians, or the greater number, or even that many among them would apoſtatize? No: only *ſome*, τινες, a word which to me appears to deſignate only an inconſiderable ſect, compared with the great ſociety of chriſtians. I may alſo add, that Mede's explanation was ſoon after refuted by the learned proteſtant commentator Dr Whitby, who ſhewed that the prophecy of the apoſtle regarded not the preſent, but the firſt age of the chriſtian church (*n*).

On the ſubject of indulgences, and works of penance, Mr Faber, like his predeceſſors, has deſcribed indulgences as pardons, and works of penance as attonements of ſin. In ſome of the preceding pages this miſtake has been already noticed: nor ſhall I fatigue the reader by a repetition of what I have previouſly advanced. (*o*) One line, however, has

(*n*) As Mr Faber after Mede refers to St Epiphanius, let him conſult that father (Hæres. 48): he will find that, in his opinion, the prediction was evidently verified in the heresy of the Cataphrygæ, and ſimilar ſects: σαφως πεπληρωται.

(*o*) Perhaps the following paſſage from a catholic divine may convince him that we do not derogate from the efficacy of Chriſt's paſſion even by works, as they are called, of ſatisfaction. Nulla

dropt from the pen of Mr Faber, which requires some observation. The bishop of Durham, he tells us, "does not censure the austerities of penance, *if found to be of any use.*" (*p*) What are we to infer from this vague and uncertain information? That the Right Rev. Prelate has not yet made up his mind on the utility of works of penance, and therefore does not chuse either to sanction or condemn them? This certainly displays a more amiable modesty, and less of a dogmatising spirit, than some persons have thought they discovered in his charge: but it should be remembered that christianity has now been preached about eighteen hundred years, and that it is certainly time that those, who are teachers of Israel, should be able to afford some information on so interesting a subject. That in the ancient church, the austerities of penance were deemed of great utility, is evident both from the ancient penitential canons, and the writings of the ancient fathers. In modern times it seems that they present a problem of considerable difficulty, which the prelates of the reformed churches, after three hundred years deliberation, are yet unable to solve.

On the nature of the provocation given by the bishop's charge, Mr Faber has also fallen into a mistake. The remarker did not complain that the Right Rev. Prelate had attempted to prove the

prorsus est satisfactio ab homine quovis peracta, quæ Deo sit grata, vel quæ sit alicujus omnino valoris, nisi per merita Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Christus est, qui solum vere et plene pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, ex quo omnis nostra sufficientia. Nostra namque satisfactio, qualis est, et quo modo nostra est, potius est quædam meritorum Christi nobis applicatio, quam propria aliqua satisfactio. Sicut autem per fidem, juxta aliquorum opinionem nobis applicantur Christi merita, ita et per quæcumque opera pia et in Deo facta. Nihil enim in nobis tanquam ex nobis, sed in eo qui nos confortat omnia possumus, &c. Holden, Analasys Fidei, c. v. § 5.

(*p*) Faber's Answer, p. 101.

truth of the proteſtant, or to diſprove the truth of the catholic creed. This is a right which he will deny to no one. The ſubject of his complaint was, the unfair and uncandid manner in which he had conducted his attack. It was, that he had attributed to us doctrines, which we reprobate as ſincerely as himſelf; and on the fictitious belief of ſuch doctrines, had held us out to the contempt and execration of the public. When apocalyptic interpreters have recourſe to ſuch artifices to eke out their reſpective ſyſtems concerning the w—— of Babylon, we may amuſe ourſelves with the punny efforts of their bigotry or credulity. But the perſonal character, and the high ſtation of the Biſhop of Durham, beſtow a dignity and importance on ſuch imputations, when he is their author. Then we owe it to ourſelves, to our country, and to the truth, to vindicate our innocence. This was the provocation which originally called forth the pen of the remarker. Nor has he any reaſon to regret the occaſion, or the iſſue of the conteſt. He may ſay with Ajax, (nor will the public voice diſpute the truth of my opinion),

Si quæritis hujus
Fortunam pugnæ, non ſum ſuperatus ab illo.

OBSERVATIONS

ON SOME

FASHIONABLE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Calvinus sapuit quia non scripsit in Apocolypsim.
SCALIGER.

DURING the long lapſe of more than fifteen centuries, the viſion of the apoſtle St John had been enveloped in the thickeſt obſcurity. At the æra of the reformation, a ſtrong ray of apocalyptic light diſſipated the clouds which popery had raiſed: and ſince that period every old woman, of either gender, has been able to unravel with eaſe the web of myſtery, and to reveal to the world the true meaning of the book of Revelations. From the days of Luther to the preſent, we have poſſeſſed a numerous and uninterrupted ſucceſſion of tranſlators, lecturers, expoſitors, and annotators, who may truly be ſaid to have ſeen viſions, and to have dreamed dreams: and, leſt by ſome miſhap the pious race ſhould become extinct, Biſhop Warburton has left a fund for the ſupport or the reward of the more fiery among its members. (*a*) I may admire his zeal, but not his wiſdom. He probably did not ſee that he was thus endeavouring to diffuſe and perpetuate an alarming ſpecies of intellectual diſeaſe which, for the ſake of

(*a*) According to his will, an annual ſermon is preached in Lincoln's inn chapel, to prove the Pope to be Antichriſt, &c. &c.

diſtinction, I ſhall beg leave to call the apocalyptic mania. It has not, indeed, been hitherto claſsed in any ſyſtem of noſology; but it is not on that account leſs real, or leſs general; and, I truſt, I ſhall confer a benefit on the reader by proceeding to point out the origin, and to deſcribe the ſymptoms of this theological malady.

When "the magnanimous fathers of the reformation" broke from the communion of the catholic church, they found it convenient to juſtify their ſchiſm by pleading, that the Pope was Antichriſt, and Rome the ſcarlet w—— of Babylon. This doctrine, while it inflamed the bigotry, flattered the ſpiritual pride of their diſciples: with the conſcious ſuperiority of birth, they ſought in the apocalypſe for proofs of the ignominous deſcent of their opponents, and their ſacrilegious familiarity with the myſterious volume, quickly produced the diſeaſe, which is the ſubject of the preſent obſervations. Its progreſs was rapid. It ſoon pervaded every department in life; but its moſt diſtinguiſhed victims were, and ſtill are, choſen from among thoſe churchmen, who, from the inſtructions of the nurſery or the univerſity, have imbibed a lively dread of the horrors of popery. The mania firſt manifeſts itſelf by a reſtleſs anxiety reſpecting the future fortunes of the church, and a ſtrong attachment to prophetic hieroglyphics: the antichriſt and the man of ſin; the beaſt with ten horns, and the beaſt with two horns; the armies of God and Magog; the fall of Babylon, and the arrival of the millenium became the favourite, the only ſubject of ſtudy; falſe and ridiculous perceptions amuſe the imagination; the judgment is gradually enfeebled, and, at laſt, the moſt powerful minds ſink into the imbecillity of childhood. Of the truth of this deſcription we

have a melancholy proof in the great Sir Iſaac Newton. To him Nature ſeemed to have unlocked her choiceſt ſecrets: as a philoſopher he was and is ſtill unrivalled: but no ſooner did he direct his teleſcope from the motions of the heavenly bodies to the viſions in the apocalypſe, than his head grew dizzy, the downfall of popery danced before his eyes, and he hazarded predictions which, on the ſcale of prophets, have placed him far beneath the well-known Francis Moore, Eſq. phyſician and almanac-maker.

It ſhould be obſerved, that this intellectual malady, like the other ſpecies of mania, aſſumes a thouſand different ſhapes, according to the prediſpoſition of the ſubject which it attacks. I ſhall produce a few inſtances: in 1789, Mr Cook publiſhed a tranſlation of the apocalypſe, with keys to open its meaning to his readers. This reverend gentleman was Greek profeſſor in the univerſity at Cambridge; and, as his reading naturally led him to the Greek poets, he was determined that the author of the apocalypſe ſhould be a poet, and, moreover, the rival of Sophocles. In his opinion, the apocalypſe is a tragedy formed on the ſame plan as the Œdipus Tyrannus. "The drama opens with the temple ſcene: the ſeals, the trumpet, and the vials unfold the plot; and though the antichriſt does not die, no more than Œdipus, yet he falls into ſuch calamity as makes him an object of pity, and juſtifies the lamentations pronounced on his downfall." Nor is this all. By trying one of his apocalyptic keys on the Odyſſey of Homer, he has diſcovered that poem alſo to have been inſpired, and informs us that the ſuitors of Penelope repreſent the vaſſals of popery, who, under the pretence of courting the bride, the chriſtian church, devour all the good things in her

houſe, till Chriſt, the true Ulyſſes, the ὁδὸς σωσ or ſafe way, arrives, and wreaks his vengeance on them.—In Mr Granville Sharp, the favourite apocalyptic Noſtradamus of the rector of Newnton Longville, (Le Mes. reply, p. 193, 202,) the mania has ſhewn itſelf in a different maner. This gentleman is known to be ſingularly partial to monoſyllables. He has written a volume on the Hebrew letter vau, and another on the Greek articles ὁ, ἡ, τὸ. From letters and articles he was induced, by his previous ſucceſs and the importunity of his friends, to proceed to the explication of the viſions in the book of Revelations. Here the apocalyptic mania ſoon diſcovered itſelf: but the appearance of the diſeaſe was modified by his previous habits of monoſyllabic inveſtigation. He convinced himſelf that the name of the beaſt was Lateinos, and that Lateinos muſt ſignify the Latin church. The proof is curious. Lateinos, he contends, is derived from the Hebrew monoſyllable LAT, which means to cover or conceal. Now the Latin church, in the celebration of the maſs, conceals ſome of the prayers from the people by ordering them to be pronounced with a low voice: therefore the Latin church is Lateinos, the beaſt in the apocalypſe. Moreover the head of the Latin church reſides in the palace of the Lateran, a name derived from the ſame monoſyllable LAT; and the Lateran palace is ſituated in the country anciently called Latium, an appellation alſo derived from the ſame monoſyllable LAT: and Latium is a province of that part of Europe called Italy, which alſo derives its name from the ſame monoſyllable LAT. Be not ſtartled, gentle reader: apocalyptic maniacs can with equal facility read backwards or forwards; and Mr Sharp informs us, that, if we read Italy backwards, we ſhall have Ylati, in the

midſt of which is the ſame Hebrew monoſyllable LAT. (*b*) Naviget Anticyram.—In Mr Galloway the viſions of St John aſſumed a different character from the horror with which the interpreter viewed the French revolution. With him the beaſt of the bottomleſs pit was France, the little horn was France, the man of ſin was France, and antichriſt was France. Mr Galloway was a punſter; and, during his apocalyptic paroxyſm, he was unable to diſtinguiſh between a pun and a ſyllogiſm. The beaſt, he tells us, is *revolutionary* France, becauſe the beaſt ſprung from the earth, which is a *revolutionary* planet, performing diurnal *revolutions* round its axis, and annual revolutions round the ſun. (*c*) —With Meſſrs Kett and Bicheno, hiſtory appears to be the dominant idea. Mr Kett has ſent St John to a cavern in the iſle of Patmos, to employ himſelf in writing a prophetic hiſtory of England, deſcribing in detail the miſeries it ſhould ſuffer under the iron yoke of popery, and its final liberation from them by the glorious revolution of 1688.—Mr Bicheno has transferred the ſcene from England to Germany; but, leſt the diſtance ſhould leſſen the intereſt of the book, in the judgment of the Engliſh reader, he has added a diſcovery, which muſt bring it home to every heart. He aſſures us, that the preſent generation

(O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint!)

do actually enjoy, and have long enjoyed, the promiſed millenium of peace, virtue and happineſs!

Were I to deſcribe all the varieties of the diſeaſe, these obſervations would ſwell to an unmeaſurable bulk.

(*b*) Granville Sharp to the Hebrew Nation, p. 127—131.
(*c*) See Brief Commentaries on such parts of the Revelations and other prophecies, as immediately refer to the present times, by Joseph Galloway, Esq.

I shall therefore content myself with noticing the prophetic, which is perhaps the most prevalent, species. When the mind is seized with this mania, the regions of futurity are instantly opened to its sight: it can point out the date and nature of every event which is to happen; it can inform us in what year popery, mohammedism, and infidelity are to perish; when and where antichrist is to be born, reign and die; who is to restore the holy land to the Jews; and in what year the new Jerusalem is to descend from heaven. It is in vain that preceding prophets have frequently outlived their own predictions: the lessons of experience are heard with contempt: and each new seer is convinced of the truth of his own visions. Among those who have suffered lately under this form of the disease, the most distinguished are Mr Whitaker and Mr Faber, both scholars of extensive erudition, and both equally animated against the church of Rome. They both agree that Luther is the angel with the everlasting gospel: and, if by his gospel they mean the doctrine noticed in the forty-fifth page of this work, they have a chance to be right. It may be justly called everlasting; for it will probably find proselytes, as long as man shall dwell on the earth. Mr Whitaker discovers that the two horns of the beast are the two monastic orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans. Why they should claim the preference before their brethren, of greater antiquity or more general diffusion, I know not: but it is certainly unfortunate that the beast has not four horns; then you, ye sons of Benedict and Loyola, might have had the honour of being seated on the remaining two. The same gentleman informs us that the Ottoman empire will soon fall, Rome be wrested from the pope, and the seat of the papacy be transferred to Jerusalem. Mr

Faber makes an equal display of erudition: but the third angel, Mr Whitaker's Zuingle, he has placed in a most uncomfortable situation: he has bound him fast in the midst of the ocean, and transformed him into the *insular church of England!* Nor does he always agree with his rival in more important points. The two beasts he shews to be the two contemporary Roman empires, temporal and spiritual, under the emperors and the popes: and gives his readers the pleasing intelligence, that both the Turk and the Pope will expire in the year 1868.—Though he does not expect to witness this happy event himself, yet he has the goodness to promise a sight of it to many of the present generation:

Τλητε, φιλοι, και μεινατ' επι χρονον, οφρα δαωμεν
Ει στεον καλχας μαντευεται, ηε και ουκι.

Unfortunately for these two prophets, each disputed the accuracy of the predictions of his rival: an animated controversy followed; and the result has been a conviction in the minds of most of their readers, that each has completely succeeded in demolishing the system of his adversary, and completely failed in establishing his own.

Thus have I attempted to describe the different symptoms of this disease: but I hope I shall be excused from indicating the method of cure. When the mania has once obtained possession of the brain, I doubt whether three Anticyræ would be sufficient to expel it. I would rather, like Dr Trotter in his treatise on the nervous temperament, endeavour to correct that *predisposition* which naturally leads to it. I would advise the protestant theologian to suspend, for a while at least, his assent to some of those doctrines, which education has taught him to revere as

ſacred. I would have him learn to doubt whether it be certain, that a long ſucceſſion of biſhops, through many centuries, can be that one individual deſcribed by St Paul as the man of ſin: or that the church, from which almoſt all other churches have received the knowledge of the goſpel, is "the great mother of harlots," and the kingdom of Antichriſt. I would recommend to him, if he muſt decypher the apocalyptic hieroglyphics, to attend to the ſolemn aſſeveration of their author, which is frequently repeated both in the firſt and the laſt chapters, that his predictions were, even at the time in which he wrote, on the point of being fulfilled. In the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the firſt period of chriſtian hiſtory, he may find enough to exerciſe his ingenuity, and may perhaps ſtumble on the only clue, which can lead to the ſolution of the difficulties contained in their myſterious volume. I am aware that what I aſk, will not readily be granted to me. The doctrine that popery is the beaſt, the pope antichriſt, and chriſtian Rome the whore of Babylon, is, I know, an important part of the new goſpel preached by Luther and his aſſociates: it forms, to uſe the words of a learned prelate, (*d*) "a primary pillar of the reformed faith." But when I conſider the dangerous conſequences of this doctrine, its deleterious effects on the judgment of ſome among the moſt diſtinguiſhed writers of the proteſtant communion, the ridicule which it ſerves to throw on the inſpired writings, and the handle which it gives to the ſneers and contempt of the profeſſed infidel, I indulge a well-founded hope that, for the ſake of religion and humanity, it will meet with little ſupport from the enlightened characters, who now preſide in the eſtabliſhed church. If it once

(*d*) Watſon's Theological Tracts. Tom. v. p. 7.